



U.S. Department of the Treasury Office of Inspector General



Report of Investigation

Case Title: First National Bank of Davis

Case #: BANK-11-0730-I

Investigation Initiated: March 6, 2011

Case Type: Criminal ☒ X

Investigation Completed: DEC 31 2018

Administrative ☐

Civil ☐

Origin: Federal Deposit Insurance Corp.

Conducted by: Anthony J. Scott
Special Agent in Charge

Approved by: Sally Luttrell
Acting AIGI

Summary

On February 28, 2011, the U.S. Department of Treasury Office of Inspector General (TIG) was apprised of the financial condition of a financial institution under the regulation and oversight of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC). Specifically, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) OIG Dallas Office referred allegations that the First National Bank of Davis, OK, (FNB Davis) was on the verge of failing. (b) (8)

The president made the loans apparently to make the bank's financial condition appear stronger than it is actually was. At issue were approximately \$1.6 million in delinquent loans that the OCC had directed the president to charge off. Rather than doing as he was directed, the bank president, W.A. Moore, underwrote new loans to unqualified and possibly straw, or unknowing, borrowers.

TIG substantiated the allegations and found that First National Bank of Davis, OK officials committed bank fraud. Two bank officials, Bank President W.A. Moore, and Roy Wesberry were convicted of bank fraud (18 USC 1344) in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Oklahoma.

Basis and Scope of the Investigation

This case was initiated on March 6, 2011, from the FDIC OIG regarding the possible failure of the FNB Davis and allegations of bank fraud by bank officials.

During the course of the investigation, interviews were conducted with:

- OCC Bank Examiners
- FDIC Bank Examiners
- FNB Davis Clients

During the course of the investigation, TIG reviewed pertinent documents, including:

- Asset Quality Memos
- Financial Transaction reports
- Loan documents

Investigative Activity

In an interview by TIG, FDIC, and FBI, OCC National Bank Examiners, (b) (7)(C) [REDACTED] attested to the substantive nature of the Asset Quality Memo's dated February 28, 2011 and March 11, 2011. In addition, the two examiners provided their experiences and events that transpired during their last examination of FNB Davis.

All employees were cooperative with the examination, providing the requested files pertaining to certain loans. While examining these files, many, if not most, files were incomplete; missing critical documentation and information.

Additionally, when the FNB Davis bank president, W.A. "Dub" Moore, was approached as to the reason why some loans were not charged off, he made statements to the effect that they were not able to be charged off or that the loan was in good standing. Actions taken by Moore after these encounters included issuing loans to straw borrowers in order to off-set the poor performing loans. It appears that Moore would convince borrowers to take out additional loans with the promise that their original loans would be granted and that the secondary loan would be repaid within a matter of months, well before their maturity date and without any amount owed by the borrower. These types of loans were generated, apparently, to negate the poor performing loans and to give the impression that FNB Davis was performing at a certain level when, in actuality, it was "broke" according to (b) (7) [REDACTED]

This Report of Investigation is the property of the Office of Investigation, Treasury Office of the Inspector General. It contains sensitive law enforcement information and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission in accordance with 5 U.S.C. § 552. This report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited.

The two examiners had different opinions of Moore. (b) (7)(C) felt (b) (7) was a stand up individual whereas [REDACTED] felt he was a manipulative businessman. Some of [REDACTED] opinions lend itself to a conversation to which Moore implied bodily harm to himself. Arnold was aware of the fact that Moore kept a pistol in his office and became concerned regarding Moore's state of mind.

In summary, both [REDACTED] discussed the difficulties in performing an accurate bank examination due to incomplete loan files, withholding of information by bank employees, speculatively at the direction of Moore as well as misleading actions on the part of Moore to gain a positive bank rating.

The individuals below were interviewed by FDIC officials during the process of closing FNBD. The following key points were extracted during those interviews.

[REDACTED] Loan Customer

[REDACTED] discussed his loans with FNB Davis and also relayed the fact that when signing paperwork for his loans, [REDACTED] presented a note to sign for Southern Rock. He stated he would not do so. [REDACTED] further advised that he had never discussed Southern Rock with anyone and believed [REDACTED] had made a mistake.

FDIC Examiners – (b) (7)(C)

(b) (7) commented that while speaking to [REDACTED], Loan Officer, [REDACTED] stated that Moore was a proponent of verbal agreements. (b) (7)(C) further gave a brief overview of how the Cash Flow Manager system operated. A customer who would provide an invoice would be advanced 95% with fees of 5%. Payment was due of receivables in 90 days.

OCC Examiners (b) (7)(C)

(b) (7)(C) (b) (8) [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

(b) (7)(C) – Loan Officer

██████████ stated that she believes the bank failure was due in part to the Southern Rock entities (SR). SR loans were not performing. After the start of OCC's most recent exam, Dub Moore, former FNB Davis president, made loans to several parties where all or part of the proceeds were intended to reduce SR's indebtedness to the bank. These loans were poorly underwritten and highly questionable extensions of credit.

A secondary issue relating to the failure of the bank was Arbuckle Wilderness Development (AWD). The owner, **(b) (7)(C)** was frequently overdrawn and behind on loans. Several parties took loans with the proceeds used to reduce AWD's indebtedness. **(b) (7)(C)** did state that she was not aware of any improper financial benefit to Moore at any time.

(b) (7)(C) – Loan Customer **(b) (7)(C)**

(b) (7)(C) stated that when he applied for loans for the purchase/lease of oil wells, he applied to FNB Davis because he believed Moore to be of good character. **(b) (7)(C)** admittedly had poor credit, but Moore worked out an agreement to finance the oil lease. ██████████ was told by Moore that he needed to buy some equipment which had been owned by Roy Westberry and could finance it for a 90 day time period until a Small Business Administration (SBA) loan could be funded for SR/Westberry. ██████████ further stated that it was his understanding that he was buying the equipment from the bank. He became concerned when he never received the equipment and was not aware of what kind of equipment was purchased. ██████████ made inquiries to **(b) (7)(C)** for a list of equipment, but was told that she did not have a list and that ██████████ would have to obtain that list from Westberry. Additionally, ██████████ stated that he was given the impression, albeit verbally that Moore would look more favorably in issuing the loan to ██████████ if he worked with Moore.

(b) (7)(C) – Collections

██████████ stated that the failure of the bank was caused by the Cash Flow Management (CFM) accounts and SR (SR). ██████████ further outlined the process of the CFM system. A borrower who brought an invoice to the bank would be advanced 96% of the invoice amount and keep 4% for fees for 90 days. The customer would pay the borrower and the bank was supposed to get paid the receivable. The bank was not paid on the SR account.

██████████ mentioned another CFM customer, ██████████ who stated that he had paid \$25,000 cash to ██████████ to pay down his loan. The money was not credited to his account. ██████████ also stated that ██████████ has a lot of bad and slow pay loans.

(b) (7)(C) – Senior Vice President, Lending

stated the cause of the bank failure was due to the business the FNB Davis had with SR. stated that Moore was the type of person who found reasons to make loans to people based on his 40 year experience in lending and his devotion to the people in the community. said he trusted Moore's judgement. When was asked if Moore had ever taken any rewards, kickbacks or had any work performed by Westberry or other customers, stated that Westberry built a small pond for Moore. further advised that he monitored the CFM program. He stated that the CFM program was not considered to be a loan. The customers were and SR. The bank loaned 98% and took 2% fee for managing the receivables.

(b) (7)(C) – Senior Vice President, Operations Secretary

(b) (7)(C) stated that the FND failed due to bad lending decisions. FNB Davis had a flurry of bad loans recently but she didn't know that the bank was failing. stated that she composed Board minutes and prepared the information for Board members which included information about overdrafts. stated that came to her and was concerned about loans that Moore was making. stated she went directly to Moore and asked him what he was doing regarding the loans. Moore mentioned a truck service company loan and a USDA loan that had already been approved and was awaiting funding. was very certain that Moore received no financial gain from any of the borrowers. believed that Moore firmly believed in the loans. Moore told that everything was clear and open regarding his actions.

(b) (7)(C) – Loan Processor

(b) (7)(C) stated that FNB Davis failed due to (b) (7)(C) and SR. (b) (7) further stated that Moore took the fall for (b) (7)(C). Moore took over the SR account, and had weekly meeting with Westberry and (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) was pulled from those meetings in the summer of 2010. (b) (7) worked directly under (b) (7)(C) and Moore. On several occasions, (b) (7) stated that (b) (7)(C) instructed her to shred documentation regarding loans.

(b) (7)(C) – Loan Processor

(b) (7)(C) was asked about the delinquent loans. She stated that was chronically late (45 days) on payments. prepared the debt schedule for the SR payoffs. stated she was aware of the SR and overdrafts. also stated she was surprised that the loan for was approved. Moore was also upset because put the funding payment information in the (b) (7)(C) loan file.

(b) (7)(C) – Loan Processor

(b) (7)(C) stated that FNBD failed due to Moore's "big heart" and SR and also mentioned finalized loans without complete documentation.

(b) (7)(C) – Loan Customer

was involved in a relationship resembling a partnership with Wilderness. stated he has assumed a \$2.6 MM loan from a USDA participation loan with Yukon Bank.

Referrals

On June 26, 2012, TIG presented this case to Assistant United States Attorney (AUSA) Melody Nelson, U.S. Attorney's Office, Eastern District of Oklahoma. The case was accepted for prosecution.

Judicial Action

On August 11, 2014, was acquitted by jury in U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Oklahoma, on one count of Conspiracy to Commit Bank Fraud, and two counts of Bank Fraud.

On October 20, 2014, Roy Lynn Wesberry, was convicted by jury on four (4) counts of Bank Fraud (18 USC 1344) and one count Conspiracy to Commit Bank Fraud (18 USC 1349), in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Oklahoma. On August 12, 2015, Wesberry received an 87 month sentence and a restitution of \$3,216,031.22. On December 20, 2016, after an appeal, Wesberry received a 60 month sentence and a three year probation.

On December 3, 2014, Bank President WA Moore received a restitution of \$14,698,660.98, a sentence of 24 months, and a special assessment of \$100 for one count of bank fraud (18 USC 1344) in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Oklahoma.

Findings

Our investigation substantiated that bank representatives with the First National Bank of Davis committed bank fraud. Two of these representatives were convicted of bank fraud (18 USC 1344) in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Oklahoma.

This Report of Investigation is the property of the Office of Investigation, Treasury Office of the Inspector General. It contains sensitive law enforcement information and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission in accordance with 5 U.S.C. § 552. This report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited.

Distribution

NA

Signatures

Case Agent:

h 
Anthony J. Scott

12/31/19
Date

Supervisor:

h 
Sally Luttrell (Acting)

12/21/19
Date



OFFICE OF
INSPECTOR GENERAL

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20220

FEB 21 2019

MEMORANDUM FOR THE OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS

FROM:

[REDACTED]
Special Agent in Charge (Acting)

SUBJECT:

Request for assistance to the Office of the Director of National
Intelligence (ODNI)
TIG Case Number: BEP-18-0100-I

On May 29, 2018, the Department of the Treasury, Office of Inspector General, Office of Investigations (TIG), received a request from ODNI Analyst [REDACTED], requesting investigative assistance. It was requested that TIG assist in an ODNI open investigation to determine if suspected U.S. currency was counterfeit, as well as determining the date of manufacture, and bank of first deposit.

A preliminary investigation by TIG determined several serial numbers printed on the suspected U.S. currency are not valid, indicating those notes are counterfeit.

In December 2018, the ODNI advised TIG no additional assistance was required. As a result, this matter is being closed accordingly.

This report is the property of the Office of Inspector General, and is For Official Use Only. It contains sensitive law enforcement information, the use and dissemination of which is subject to the Privacy Act, 5 U.S.C. § 552a. This information may not be copied or disseminated without the written permission of the OIG, which will be granted only in accordance with the Privacy Act and the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. § 552. Any unauthorized or unofficial use or dissemination of this information will be penalized.

Office of Inspector General – Investigations
Department of the Treasury



OFFICE OF
INSPECTOR GENERAL

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20220

MAY 24 2019

MEMORANDUM FOR THE OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS

FROM:

[REDACTED]
Special Agent in Charge

SUBJECT:

Unknown Subject – Treasury Direct Case

OIG File Number: BFS-18-0102-I

In July 2018, an investigation was initiated by the U.S. Department of the Treasury, Office of Inspector General, Office of Investigations (TIG) at the request of the U.S. Attorney's Office, Western District of Texas, Austin, TX regarding the theft of approximately \$32,000 from a Bank of America (BOA) savings account belonging to Richard A. Overton. Overton was the oldest WWII survivor and resided in Austin, TX.

From February 15, 2018 to June 7, 2018, seven separate unauthorized ACH withdrawals were conducted from Overton's BOA account, payable to U.S. Treasury Direct, in order to purchase U.S. Treasury securities. The Austin, TX Police Department (APD) and the Federal Bureau of Investigations (FBI), Austin, TX were the lead agencies in this case.

[Agent's Note: Overton's BOA savings account was compensated in full by the U.S. Department of the Treasury, and Overton passed away on December 27, 2018 in Austin, TX.]

TIG provided Treasury Direct records requested by the APD and FBI. APD and FBI subpoenaed bank and other available records and conducted interviews in an attempt to identify any viable subjects. No subjects were identified during this investigation.

This report is the property of the Office of Inspector General, and is For Official Use Only. It contains sensitive law enforcement information, the use and dissemination of which is subject to the Privacy Act, 5 U.S.C. § 552a. This information may not be copied or disseminated without the written permission of the OIG, which will be granted only in accordance with the Privacy Act and the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. § 552. Any unauthorized or unofficial use or dissemination of this information will be penalized.

Office of Inspector General – Investigations
Department of the Treasury

After discussing this matter with Assistant U.S. Attorney (AUSA) [REDACTED], Western District of Texas, Austin, TX it was decided that the USAO, TIG, FBI, and APD will close this investigation.

As a result, TIG determined that the allegations do not merit additional investigative resources, and the matter is being closed accordingly.

This report is the property of the Office of Inspector General, and is For Official Use Only. It contains sensitive law enforcement information, the use and dissemination of which is subject to the Privacy Act, 5 U.S.C. § 552a. This information may not be copied or disseminated without the written permission of the OIG, which will be granted only in accordance with the Privacy Act and the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. § 552. Any unauthorized or unofficial use or dissemination of this information will be penalized.

Office of Inspector General – Investigations
Department of the Treasury



OFFICE OF
INSPECTOR GENERAL

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20220

OCT 17 2018

MEMORANDUM FOR [REDACTED], PRINCIPAL SENIOR ADVISOR
OFFICE OF FINANCIAL RESEARCH

FROM: [REDACTED] ■ [REDACTED] ■
Special Agent in Charge

SUBJECT: Harassing Email
Office of Financial Research
OIG Case Number: DO-18-0075-I

Attached for your review is our Report of Investigation (ROI) into allegations that an Office of Financial Research (OFR) contractor received a veiled threat via email to his official Treasury email address. The investigation determined that the allegation was substantiated.

The ROI and attached documentation are provided to assist you in determining whether corrective administrative action may be warranted. Please provide a written response within ninety (90) days of the date on this memorandum advising what administrative actions, if any, you have taken in response to this ROI's finding(s) and/or recommendations, and explaining either why those actions were taken or why no action was taken. When responding, please identify this matter by its case number, DO-18-0075-I, and transmit your response to the TOIG electronic mail intake at OIGINTAKE@oig.treas.gov.

If you have any questions concerning this matter, or require any attachments referenced in the ROI exhibits, or if you develop information that may indicate a need for additional or new investigative activity to assist you in resolving this matter, please contact me at [REDACTED].

Exhibit 1

Thigpen, Leola

From: (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Friday, March 16, 2018 10:51 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: harrassing email sent to OFR contractor employee
Attachments: 2059_001.pdf

[REDACTED] please include the attachment in the OFR complaint

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 13, 2018 3:40 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: harrassing email sent to OFR contractor employee

As a follow up to the other email I just sent. See attached.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 13, 2018 3:29 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: harrassing email sent to OFR contractor employee

[REDACTED] only brought this to management's attention today. Worth opening as a prelim?

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 13, 2018 2:35 PM
To: [REDACTED] >
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Attached Image

[REDACTED] –

Per my voicemail from 2:30 today, attached is an email provided to us by a contractor working on site at OFR, [REDACTED] who reported to us today that he is concerned that, connected with the attached email, he is being treated differently. For example, he reports that he has overheard staff whispering "That's the guy" when he is present. Our COO, [REDACTED], copied, is also reporting this to FPS. Please contact me to discuss at your earliest convenience.

Thanks, [REDACTED]

From: svc-docscanner-se@ofr.treasury.gov [<mailto:svc-docscanner-se@ofr.treasury.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, March 13, 2018 2:14 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Attached Image

Confidentiality Notice: This e-mail message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or otherwise protected from disclosure. If you have received this message in error, please delete this message and any attachments, and notify the sender immediately. If you are not the intended recipient, you

are hereby notified that the disclosure, copying, or distribution of the contents of this transmission is strictly prohibited. An inadvertent disclosure is not intended to waive any privileges.

FINANCIALRESEARCH.gov

Exhibit 2

[REDACTED] (Contractor)

From: James Brown <jenneyb22@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2018 4:37 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Tag

We found something on you. We will spread it all over OFR. you may as well quit now. We have you right where we want you. We will squeeze you tell you pop

Exhibit 3



MEMORANDUM OF ACTIVITY



Case Number: DO-18-0040-P	Reporting Office: Investigations	Type of Activity: Interview - Other
Date of Activity: March 22, 2018	Date Report Drafted: February 23, 2018	Location of Activity: Telephonic interview
Subject of Activity: [REDACTED] Director, Office of Security Programs Department of the Treasury [REDACTED] [REDACTED]		Activity Conducted By (Name(s) and Title(s)): [REDACTED] Special Agent

On March 22, 2018, the Department of the Treasury, Office of Inspector General (TIG), telephonically spoke with [REDACTED], Director, Office of Security Programs Department of the Treasury, regarding a veiled threat that was emailed from James Brown <jenneyb22@gmail.com> to a Department of the Treasury contractor, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] stated that in or around November 2017, acting Director for Office of Financial Research (OFR), [REDACTED] called [REDACTED] supervisor, [REDACTED] and Assistant Secretary for Facilities & Operations, [REDACTED] to report "ominous" videos found on YouTube. These videos had words written in red letters with a Johnny Cash song playing. This song involved death. [REDACTED] visited the YouTube site the day after it was reported to her and the video had been removed. [REDACTED] does not have a YouTube username or a link for the video.

[REDACTED] stated that this was the third or fourth video that had been posted but that this aforementioned video was "the most concerning."

[REDACTED] stated that OFR has had two or three instances where there were drawings and words written on glass walls within the OFR office. There were two instances where the words "are you still here" were written. The other instance had penises drawn on the glass wall. [REDACTED] stated she believed there were pictures of the incident and that a contracted employee was terminated as a result.

[REDACTED] stated that after receiving the report of the email threat from [REDACTED] Chief Operating Officer for OFR, she searched her employee records for anyone with

This report contains sensitive law enforcement material and is the property of the Office of Inspector General. It may not be copied or reproduced without written permission from the Office of Inspector General. This report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. Its disclosure to unauthorized persons is strictly prohibited and may subject the disclosing party to liability. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. §§ 552, 552a.

MEMORANDUM OF ACTIVITY

Case Number: DO-18-0040-P	Subject of Activity (<i>Brief Description</i>): [REDACTED]	Date of Activity: March 22, 2018
----------------------------------	---	---

the name/resembling the name [REDACTED]. Her search produced too many possible matches.

This report contains sensitive law enforcement material and is the property of the Office of Inspector General. It may not be copied or reproduced without written permission from the Office of Inspector General. This report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. Its disclosure to unauthorized persons is strictly prohibited and may subject the disclosing party to liability. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. §§ 552, 552a.

Date Printed: 6/25/18
OI Form-09 (10/01)

Office of Inspector General – Investigations
Department of the Treasury

Exhibit 4



MEMORANDUM OF ACTIVITY



Case Number: DO-18-0040-P	Reporting Office: Investigations	Type of Activity: Interview - Other
Date of Activity: March 23, 2018	Date Report Drafted: March 23, 2018	Location of Activity: Telephonic interview
Subject of Activity: [REDACTED] IT Specialist OFR Dept of the Treasury [REDACTED] [REDACTED]		Activity Conducted By (Name(s) and Title(s)): [REDACTED] Special Agent

On March 23, 2018, the Department of the Treasury, Office of Inspector General (TIG), telephonically spoke with [REDACTED], IT Specialist, Office of Financial Research (OFR), Department of the Treasury, regarding a veiled threat that was emailed on February 21, 2018 from James Brown <jenneyb22@gmail.com> to a Department of the Treasury contractor, [REDACTED]

Although [REDACTED] a contractor with Computer Worldwide Services (CWS), [REDACTED] is [REDACTED] direct supervisor for daily Treasury business. [REDACTED] reports to CWS for time card and salary.

[REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] entered the "on boarding" or security clearance process in August 2017. [REDACTED] was cleared to begin working for OFR in December 2017. [REDACTED] noted that in his six years of employment with the Treasury Department, he has never seen a contractor take this long to be cleared. [REDACTED] started working at OFR in January 2018.

[REDACTED] stated that after [REDACTED] received the veiled threat via email on February 21, 2018, [REDACTED] requested a face to face meeting with [REDACTED]. That meeting took place on March 7, 2018. During that meeting, [REDACTED] stated to [REDACTED] that various coworkers with OFR were purposely visiting his work space (the workspace that is described as difficult to get to and is not easily accessible to people) and would peer at [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] also stated to [REDACTED] that while waiting for the elevator, OFR employees would whisper "that's him." [REDACTED] stated that he was new to OFR and did not know the names of the employees in question. [REDACTED] stated that his current work environment made him uncomfortable and he believed that [REDACTED] being in a position of power, could do something to change the environment.

This report contains sensitive law enforcement material and is the property of the Office of Inspector General. It may not be copied or reproduced without written permission from the Office of Inspector General. This report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. Its disclosure to unauthorized persons is strictly prohibited and may subject the disclosing party to liability. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. §§ 552, 552a.

MEMORANDUM OF ACTIVITY

Case Number: DO-18-0040-P	Subject of Activity (<i>Brief Description</i>): [REDACTED]	Date of Activity: March 23, 2018
----------------------------------	---	---

[REDACTED] stated that he told [REDACTED] that if the employees were whispering about [REDACTED] that it may be due to [REDACTED] being the last of 12 contractors hired in OFR. [REDACTED] stated that he was not aware of any other employee having a problem with [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] stated that he reported the meeting to his respective chain of command as well as [REDACTED], Counsel for OFR and [REDACTED], Chief Operating Officer (COO) for OFR. [REDACTED] stated that Reed instructed [REDACTED] to inform [REDACTED] that if [REDACTED] ever felt unsafe that he should report it to the armed officers located in the lobby of the building and/or physically report to the office of [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] relayed the specifics of that meeting when he met with [REDACTED] on March 9, 2018. During that conversation, without provocation from [REDACTED] [REDACTED] told [REDACTED] that during the 1980s and 1990s, [REDACTED] was involved in the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] in which authorities assisted him with his [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] ([REDACTED] is originally from [REDACTED] [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] told him that he ([REDACTED] appreciated racial diversity. [REDACTED] stated he felt there was no relevance to the sharing of that information in the context of that meeting but welcomed the statement.

[REDACTED] stated that he found out that [REDACTED] had reported the email in question to his supervisor at CWS before reporting it to [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] has had no other discussions with [REDACTED] or anyone else about the email.

This report contains sensitive law enforcement material and is the property of the Office of Inspector General. It may not be copied or reproduced without written permission from the Office of Inspector General. This report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. Its disclosure to unauthorized persons is strictly prohibited and may subject the disclosing party to liability. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. §§ 552, 552a.

Exhibit 5



MEMORANDUM OF ACTIVITY



Case Number: DO-18-0040-P	Reporting Office: Investigations	Type of Activity: Interview - Other
Date of Activity: March 30, 2018	Date Report Drafted: March 31, 2018	Location of Activity: 875 15 th St NW Washington DC 20005
Subject of Activity: ██████████ Contractor for OFR		Activity Conducted By (Name(s) and Title(s)): ██████████, Special Agent ██████████, Special Agent

On March 30, 2018, the Department of the Treasury, Office of Inspector General (TIG), interviewed ██████████ Information Technology (IT) contractor, Office of Financial Research (OFR), Department of the Treasury, regarding a veiled threat that was emailed on February 21, 2018 from James Brown <jenneyb22@gmail.com> to ██████████.

██████████ started working as an IT contractor in January 2018. He is a contractor with Computer Worldwide Services (CWS).

Presently, ██████ is attending the University of Maryland University College to finish two Master degrees in Cyber Security and a Master's in Business Administration (MBA). He attends class after completing his work at OFR. His schedule at OFR varies from six to eight hours a day. His arrival time also varies. He usually woke up at 5 a.m. and is at the Washington METRO by 6 a.m.

██████ stated that he works with a small, "skeleton" crew as an IT contractor at OFR. ██████ stated he likes it there and wishes to continue working his contract. ██████ stated he does not know how long his contract work is at OFR but he heard from a colleague that it is about a year long.

██████ described his OFR coworkers as "██████████ ██████████ could not recall ██████████ last name) is the only person ██████ talks to. ██████ works in a "bullpen" environment sharing the space with 4 other people.

██████ stated that he does not know who may have sent him the email in question. He stated that after receiving the email, he "sat" on it for one week to "assess" his

This report contains sensitive law enforcement material and is the property of the Office of Inspector General. It may not be copied or reproduced without written permission from the Office of Inspector General. This report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. Its disclosure to unauthorized persons is strictly prohibited and may subject the disclosing party to liability. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. §§ 552, 552a.

MEMORANDUM OF ACTIVITY

Case Number: DO-18-0040-P	Subject of Activity (<i>Brief Description</i>): ██████████	Date of Activity: March 30, 2018
----------------------------------	---	---

environment with the hopes observing an OFR coworker acting strangely and in turn revealing who may have sent the email. █████ stated that he eventually had to stop with his observations because he was becoming “sensitive” to every coworkers gesture and may have been taking every gesture in a negative way.

█████ stated that when he initially received the email, he took it to his CWS Project Manager █████. █████ instructed █████ to share the email with █████ who is █████ Contract Officer Representative (COR). In addition to sharing the email with █████, █████ discussed the email with █████, COO in Human Resources with OFR. █████ stated that █████ was not happy that █████ shared the email with █████. █████ stated that █████ told him to “forget about the email and move on” at which time █████ deleted the email.

[AGENT’S NOTE: █████ stated that this deletion is the reason that he took seven days to comply with this Agents request for the email header.]

█████ stated that he only reported the email to OFR because his PM (██████████) told him to. █████ stated that he did not want to create “bad blood” while working at the OFR and used the analogy of a gang infested neighborhood to describe OFR. █████ stated that if you lived in a gang infested neighborhood then you would not tell authorities of any wrong doing. You would want to keep quiet to keep the peace.

When asked why someone would target him, █████ stated that as a part of his Cyber Security duties, █████ identifies vulnerabilities in the OFR computer system which causes a lot of issues for people. He believes this is why he has overheard people whispering “shhh...he’s back there” and why people stop talking when he enters the room. █████ stated that since reporting the email, the OFR environment has gotten better for him. More of his coworkers are “being more friendly and open” with him. █████ stated that he has no idea why he would be singled out after only working for OFR for approximately 6 weeks. █████ stated there were no instances of reprimand or altercations with coworkers or management at OFR.

█████ stated that he believes the intent behind the email was to “spoof” him or to make him paranoid. █████ stated that contractors are treated differently than

This report contains sensitive law enforcement material and is the property of the Office of Inspector General. It may not be copied or reproduced without written permission from the Office of Inspector General. This report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. Its disclosure to unauthorized persons is strictly prohibited and may subject the disclosing party to liability. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. §§ 552, 552a.

MEMORANDUM OF ACTIVITY

Case Number: DO-18-0040-P	Subject of Activity (<i>Brief Description</i>): ██████████	Date of Activity: March 30, 2018
----------------------------------	---	---

government employees. █████ has had issues with some of his past contracts with other agencies. █████ stated that he has been a Cyber Security contractor with various contract companies for approximately 6-7 years. He was contracted to perform IT functions at the Social Security Administration (SSA) prior to his contract with OFR. While at the SSA, his Project Manager (PM) told █████ to let someone else complete the assigned work because of █████ accent; the PM was unable to understand █████ █████ stated he spoke with Human Resources at his contracting company and they did not take him seriously. The PM then placed █████ on a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) and changed █████ title from Senior Cyber Security Specialist to Cyber Security Specialist with, according to █████ no explanation as to why. █████ was a contractor at SSA for approximately 1 year.

█████ also worked as a contractor (contract company Highland Technology) working at the Department of Energy (DOE) for approximately 2 years. █████ stated that there was a lot of work and not enough contractors to finish causing █████ to stay at work until 2 a.m. on occasion. █████ stated that he was falling behind on his work and the President of Highland wanted to lay █████ off and put someone else in █████ place. █████ stated after that he "just left" (resigned). █████ described the environment with that contract as having too many duties, too many politics and as being a "crazy environment." In addition to the President wanting █████ laid off, █████ immediate manager also wanted █████ removed from the contract. █████ stated that █████ was told by this manager to edit a report. █████ complied and after the report was sent back with corrections from the customer, █████ was blamed for the entire report. At that point, Highland laid █████ off but █████ left before that was finalized.

█████ stated that it's normal for contractors to switch contract companies as often as he has. In the past, after his contract ends, █████ has been unemployed at times. █████ stated that he has been through stressful times in the past to include being on his second marriage and, at one point, he lived in a train station for three days (█████ later admitted this was an exaggeration).

█████ stated he once worked as a contracted Network Analyst (contract company Ceridian) working at the Department of Defense for approximately 2 years. █████ stated that his immediate supervisor, █████, and the Senior Vice President of

This report contains sensitive law enforcement material and is the property of the Office of Inspector General. It may not be copied or reproduced without written permission from the Office of Inspector General. This report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. Its disclosure to unauthorized persons is strictly prohibited and may subject the disclosing party to liability. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. §§ 552, 552a.

MEMORANDUM OF ACTIVITY

Case Number: DO-18-0040-P	Subject of Activity (<i>Brief Description</i>): ██████████	Date of Activity: March 30, 2018
----------------------------------	---	---

Ceridian, ██████████ did not get along. ██████ stated that every morning at 8 a.m., ██████ would visit ██████ desk. ██████ did not know why ██████ was singling him out. ██████ stated that maybe it was due to an incident in which Harold wanted a Blackberry configured a certain way and when ██████ refused, ██████ “blasted” ██████ using profanity. Another employee (not ██████ reported the incident and since that time, ██████ did not like ██████ ██████ was eventually laid off, according to ██████ because of his age.

After TIG further questioned ██████ about his previous contracts. ██████ revealed that while working for Ceridian contracted to DOD, ██████ received a letter via the U.S. Postal Service. ██████ could not remember exactly what the letter said but recalled the letter stating “go back to Africa.” ██████ gave the letter to his manager and to human resources. ██████ could not remember any information about the return address. After this incident, ██████ requested and was granted a transfer to Pennsylvania.

██████ also stated that he did request a transfer after his incident involving his accent while at SSA. He was not granted the transfer and instead was put on a PIP.

TIG questioned ██████ about what should happen to the sender of the email. ██████ stated that he would just want to know why the person sent it. ██████ stated that prosecution or penalties would “depend” later to clarify penalties would depend on who it was and their life circumstances. ██████ gave the example of when he worked in retail loss prevention and he caught someone stealing. The shoplifters parents were both drug addicts and ██████ did not want the shoplifter to go to jail. ██████ reiterated that this is a circumstance where prosecution is not necessary similar to what may be the case with the sender of the email.

TIG asked if ██████ knew how someone would send an email from an anonymous source to which ██████ stated he did not really know. TIG further questioned how a Cyber Security contractor would not know the details of how an anonymous email was sent to which ██████ explained the concept behind Botnets and how to create anonymous email addresses.

This report contains sensitive law enforcement material and is the property of the Office of Inspector General. It may not be copied or reproduced without written permission from the Office of Inspector General. This report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. Its disclosure to unauthorized persons is strictly prohibited and may subject the disclosing party to liability. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. §§ 552, 552a.

Date Printed: 6/25/18
OI Form-09 (10/01)

Office of Inspector General – Investigations
Department of the Treasury

MEMORANDUM OF ACTIVITY

Case Number: DO-18-0040-P	Subject of Activity (<i>Brief Description</i>): ██████ ██████	Date of Activity: March 30, 2018
----------------------------------	--	---

[AGENT'S NOTE: a Botnet is a number of internet-connected devices used to perform a cyber-attack, to steal data, send spam and allows the attacker to access the device and its connection anonymously.]

TIG asked █████ what would be his idea solution with regards to his contract with OFR. █████ stated that he would like to be transferred to another CWS contract but had not asked for the transfer yet.

TIG asked █████ who his home internet provider is and █████ stated Comcast. TIG asked █████ who his cellular telephone company is and █████ stated AT&T.

█████ provided the contact information for █████ PM for CWS as:

██████████
Computer World Services Corp. (CWS)
Chief Operating Officer (COO)
16 Executive Drive, Suite 260
Fairview Heights, IL 62208

TIG requested contact information for all contract companies █████ has worked for in the past.

This report contains sensitive law enforcement material and is the property of the Office of Inspector General. It may not be copied or reproduced without written permission from the Office of Inspector General. This report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. Its disclosure to unauthorized persons is strictly prohibited and may subject the disclosing party to liability. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. §§ 552, 552a.

Exhibit 6



MEMORANDUM OF ACTIVITY



Case Number: DO-18-0040-P	Reporting Office: Investigations	Type of Activity: Interview - Other
Date of Activity: April 16, 2018	Date Report Drafted: April 16, 2018	Location of Activity: Telephonic interview
Subject of Activity: [REDACTED] Program Manager – CWS Contract to OFR Dept of the Treasury 202.731.1401		Activity Conducted By (Name(s) and Title(s)): [REDACTED] Special Agent

On April 16, 2018, the Department of the Treasury, Office of Inspector General (TIG), telephonically spoke with [REDACTED], Program Manager for Computer World Services (CWS) contracted to Office of Financial Research (OFR), Department of the Treasury, regarding a veiled threat that was emailed on February 21, 2018 from James Brown <jenneyb22@gmail.com> to a Department of the Treasury contractor, [REDACTED].

[REDACTED] is [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Program Manager and overseas his activities while contracted to Treasury. [REDACTED] is factually aware of the occurrences in this investigation to date. [REDACTED] stated that she has spoken with [REDACTED] about the investigation and that [REDACTED] has been clear that he wants to move past the incident. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] is new to CWS (as of January 2018) and has not had any others issues thus far. CWS is happy with his performance.

TIG stated to [REDACTED] that a request was made to [REDACTED] on March 30, 2018 for a list of any contract company that [REDACTED] has worked for in the past. [REDACTED] was told by [REDACTED] that all deliverables to TIG had been met. [REDACTED] stated she will send an email to [REDACTED] with a final request for the information stating that if the information was not sent by the end of the week that repercussions will be sought.

This report contains sensitive law enforcement material and is the property of the Office of Inspector General. It may not be copied or reproduced without written permission from the Office of Inspector General. This report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. Its disclosure to unauthorized persons is strictly prohibited and may subject the disclosing party to liability. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. §§ 552, 552a.

Exhibit 7



MEMORANDUM OF ACTIVITY



Case Number: DO-18-0040-P	Reporting Office: Investigations	Type of Activity: Subpoena - OIG - Results/Review
Date of Activity: April 13, 2018	Date Report Drafted: April 13, 2018	Location of Activity: 875 15 th St NW Washington DC 20005
Subject of Activity: Google, Inc Subpoena return		Activity Conducted By (Name(s) and Title(s)): [REDACTED] Special Agent

On April 13, 2018, the Department of the Treasury, Office of Inspector General (TIG), received a subpoena return from Google, Inc. The Inspector General Subpoena was sent to Google, Inc. to ascertain further information regarding a veiled threat that was emailed on February 21, 2018 from James Brown <jenneyb22@gmail.com> to [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

The Gmail account <jenneyb22@gmail.com> was created on 02/21/2018 at 09:10:35- Universal Time (UTC).

The Gmail account <jenneyb22@gmail.com> was last logged into on 02/21/2018 at 09:11-UTC.

Google, Inc determined that <jenneyb22@gmail.com> received nine (9) consecutive login events from IP address 50.201.116.20 during the past 24 hours prior to 02/21/2018 at 09:17-(UTC).

[AGENT'S NOTE: The email was received by [REDACTED] [REDACTED] on 2/21/2018 at 09:37-UTC.]

A search for IP address 50.201.116.20 through <https://www.iplocation.net/> determined it belongs to Comcast Cable Communications, Inc. located in Gaithersburg, MD.

Attachments:

1. Google, Inc subpoena return
2. Search results from <https://www.iplocation.net/>

This report contains sensitive law enforcement material and is the property of the Office of Inspector General. It may not be copied or reproduced without written permission from the Office of Inspector General. This report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. Its disclosure to unauthorized persons is strictly prohibited and may subject the disclosing party to liability. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. §§ 552, 552a.

Date Printed: 6/25/18
OI Form-09 (10/01)

Office of Inspector General - Investigations
Department of the Treasury

MEMORANDUM OF ACTIVITY

Case Number: DO-18-0040-P	Subject of Activity (<i>Brief Description</i>): [REDACTED]	Date of Activity: March 30, 2018
----------------------------------	---	---

This report contains sensitive law enforcement material and is the property of the Office of Inspector General. It may not be copied or reproduced without written permission from the Office of Inspector General. This report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. Its disclosure to unauthorized persons is strictly prohibited and may subject the disclosing party to liability. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. §§ 552, 552a.

Date Printed: 6/25/18
OI Form-09 (10/01)

Office of Inspector General – Investigations
Department of the Treasury

Exhibit 8



MEMORANDUM OF ACTIVITY



Case Number: DO-18-0040-P	Reporting Office: Investigations	Type of Activity: Subpoena - OIG - Results/Review
Date of Activity: April 30, 2018	Date Report Drafted: April 30, 2018	Location of Activity: 875 15 th St NW Washington DC 20005
Subject of Activity: Comcast IP address: 50.201.116.20		Activity Conducted By (Name(s) and Title(s)): [REDACTED] Special Agent

On April 30, 2018, the Department of the Treasury, Office of Inspector General (TIG), received the subpoena response from Comcast Legal Response Center in reference to IP address 50.201.116.20. This IP address was the originating IP address for the veiled threat that was emailed on February 21, 2018 from James Brown <jenneyb22@gmail.com> to [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

The results are the following:

Subscriber Name: Rockville Hospitality LLC
Service Address: 20025 CENTURY Boulevard
GERMANTOWN, MD 20874
Billing Address: 20025 CENTURY Boulevard
ATT [REDACTED]
GERMANTOWN, MD 20874
Type of Service: High Speed Internet Service
Account Number: 900017792
Account Status: Active
IP Assignment: Statically Assigned

An open search revealed 20025 Century Blvd, Germantown, MD 20874 returns to a Fairfield Inn and Suites.

Attachments:

- 1.) Subpoena results from Comcast Legal Response Center

This report contains sensitive law enforcement material and is the property of the Office of Inspector General. It may not be copied or reproduced without written permission from the Office of Inspector General. This report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. Its disclosure to unauthorized persons is strictly prohibited and may subject the disclosing party to liability. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. §§ 552, 552a.

Date Printed: 6/25/18
OI Form-09 (10/01)

Office of Inspector General - Investigations
Department of the Treasury

Exhibit 9



MEMORANDUM OF ACTIVITY



Case Number: DO-18-0040-P	Reporting Office: Investigations	Type of Activity: Interview - Witness
Date of Activity: May 3, 2018	Date Report Drafted: May 3, 2018	Location of Activity: 875 15 th St NW Washington DC 20005
Subject of Activity: Fairfield Inn 20025 Century Blvd Germantown, MD 20874 IP address: 50.201.116.20		Activity Conducted By (Name(s) and Title(s)): [REDACTED] Special Agent

On May 3, 2018, the Department of the Treasury, Office of Inspector General (TIG), interviewed [REDACTED], Guest Services Manager for Fairfield Inn, 20025 Century Blvd, Germantown, MD 20874 in reference to IP address 50.201.116.20 returning to that location. This IP address was the originating IP address for the veiled threat that was emailed on February 21, 2018 from James Brown <jenneyb22@gmail.com> to [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] stated that the hotel does have a surveillance system but only keeps video for 15 days. [REDACTED] stated there is no password required to access the Wi-Fi network. [REDACTED] confirmed that [REDACTED] [REDACTED] did not stay at the Fairfield Inn on February 21, 2018. When presented with a picture of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] did not recognize him. [REDACTED] stated she was working on February 21, 2018 but did not remember anyone loitering.

This report contains sensitive law enforcement material and is the property of the Office of Inspector General. It may not be copied or reproduced without written permission from the Office of Inspector General. This report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. Its disclosure to unauthorized persons is strictly prohibited and may subject the disclosing party to liability. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. §§ 552, 552a.

Date Printed: 6/25/18
OI Form-09 (10/01)

Office of Inspector General - Investigations
Department of the Treasury

Exhibit 10

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, July 16, 2018 12:48 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

We would like to end [REDACTED] employment with us effective immediately.

Please advise us on how quickly we can do this. Our preference is for revocation of system and physical access upon notice.

Thanks,

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, July 16, 2018 12:11 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

I concur and we can execute immediately. I assume we will as part of this revoke his access and take any OFR equipment immediately. Thank you.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, July 16, 2018 11:29 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

After speaking with [REDACTED] we are ready to release [REDACTED]

Over the past month his work contribution has dropped off including not updating tickets, stonewalling on tasks, and playing Jimmy [REDACTED] [REDACTED] against each other—even though all had made it clear his primary tasks were to come from [REDACTED] [REDACTED] has made repeatedly let [REDACTED] know when work was falling off and at times subject to unreasonable defensiveness. [REDACTED] also seems to be taking advantage of the telework options and with the lack of work product leaves me suspect on what he is actually doing. His relationship with [REDACTED] [REDACTED] has also deteriorated.

We would be fine with terminating him immediately.

Thanks,



Senior IT Security Specialist | [Security and Privacy](#) | Office of Financial Research



Confidentiality Notice: This e-mail message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or otherwise protected from disclosure. If you have received this message in error, please delete this message and any attachments, and notify the sender immediately. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that the disclosure, copying, or distribution of the contents of this transmission is strictly prohibited. An inadvertent disclosure is not intended to waive any privileges.

Exhibit 1 1



MEMORANDUM OF ACTIVITY



Case Number: DO-18-0075-I	Reporting Office: Investigations	Type of Activity: Subpoena - OIG - Results/Review
Date of Activity: August 13, 2018	Date Report Drafted: August 13, 2018	Location of Activity: 875 15 th St NW Washington DC 20005
Subject of Activity: Google, Inc Subpoena return		Activity Conducted By (Name(s) and Title(s)): [REDACTED], Special Agent

On August 13, 2018, the Department of the Treasury, Office of Inspector General (TIG), received a subpoena return from Google, Inc. The Inspector General Subpoena was sent to Google, Inc. to ascertain further information regarding a veiled threat that was emailed on February 21, 2018 from James Brown <jenneyb22@gmail.com> to [REDACTED]

The subpoena return from Google provided no new investigative information.

Attachments:

1. Google, Inc subpoena return

This report contains sensitive law enforcement material and is the property of the Office of Inspector General. It may not be copied or reproduced without written permission from the Office of Inspector General. This report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. Its disclosure to unauthorized persons is strictly prohibited and may subject the disclosing party to liability. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. §§ 552, 552a.

Date Printed: 8/13/18
OI Form-09 (10/01)

Office of Inspector General - Investigations
Department of the Treasury



OFFICE OF
INSPECTOR GENERAL

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20220

APR 26 2019

MEMORANDUM FOR [REDACTED], CHIEF COUSEL
FINANCIAL CRIMES ENFORCEMENT NETWORK

FROM: [REDACTED]
Special Agent in Charge

SUBJECT: [REDACTED]
OIG Case Number: FinCEN-16-2102-I

An investigation was initiated by U.S. Treasury, Office of Inspector General, Office of Investigations (TIG), after receiving a complaint from the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network (FinCEN) on June 20, 2016. FinCEN supports the Presidential Management Fellows (PMF) Program that places recent graduate students into positions at U.S. government agencies. After completing two years of training, agencies can hire PMFs as permanent federal civilian employees. A review of security clearance documentation revealed PMF graduate student, [REDACTED] did not have the appropriate clearance to work in his position and location.

A TIG investigation determined [REDACTED] did not have a fully adjudicated security clearance and considered [REDACTED] to be a potential insider threat. U.S. Treasury, Office of Counterintelligence, and FinCEN agreed to let [REDACTED] PMF participation expire and not consider him for rehire.

On June 25, 2018, TIG referred this investigation to the Federal Bureau of Investigation's (FBI) Counterespionage Division pursuant to Section 811 of the Intelligence Authorization Act. Additionally, TIG conducted a review of FinCEN security procedures under case number FinCEN-18-0031-I and submitted a final report of investigation to FinCEN management.

As a result of [REDACTED] no longer being employed by FinCEN, the TIG review of security procedures, and the referral to the FBI, TIG determined this case does not merit additional investigative resources, and is being closed accordingly.

If you have questions or if you develop information that may indicate a need for additional or new investigative activity to assist you in resolving this matter, please contact me at [REDACTED].

This report is the property of the Office of Inspector General, and is For Official Use Only. It contains sensitive law enforcement information, the use and dissemination of which is subject to the Privacy Act, 5 U.S.C. § 552a. This information may not be copied or disseminated without the written permission of the OIG, which will be granted only in accordance with the Privacy Act and the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. § 552. Any unauthorized or unofficial use or dissemination of this information will be penalized.

Office of Inspector General – Investigations
Department of the Treasury



OFFICE OF
INSPECTOR GENERAL

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS
WASHINGTON, DC 20220

MAR 07 2019

MEMORANDUM FOR THE OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS

FROM:

[REDACTED]
Special Agent in Charge

SUBJECT:

Econocentro, LP (MSB)
OIG Case Number: FinCEN-19-0026-I

An investigation was initiated by the U.S. Department of the Treasury, Office of Inspector General, Office of Investigations (TIG), after receiving a referral from the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Office of Inspector General (FDIC-OIG) related to a suspected money service business, Econocentro, LP, structuring large foreign currency exchange transfers from Mexico to the United States.

During the course of a case review, it was determined that two different case agents opened two separate cases on Econocentro, LP. A review of both cases revealed that case number MSB-19-0027-I had multiple documents and case notes supporting the investigative efforts. Case number FinCEN-19-0026-I did not have any documents or investigative notes.

As a result, case number FinCEN-19-0026-I will be closed.

This report is the property of the Office of Inspector General, and is For Official Use Only. It contains sensitive law enforcement information, the use and dissemination of which is subject to the Privacy Act, 5 U.S.C. § 552a. This information may not be copied or disseminated without the written permission of the OIG, which will be granted only in accordance with the Privacy Act and the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. § 552. Any unauthorized or unofficial use or dissemination of this information will be penalized.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 12:39 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Report of Investigation DO-18-0075-I -- Requesting Closure
Attachments: ROI DO-18-0075-I.pdf; DO-18-0075-I Transmittal Memo.pdf

This message was sent securely using ZixCorp.

[REDACTED] | Principal Senior Advisor
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Management
Department of the Treasury

(b) (7)(C) [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] 30, 2018 12:38 PM

To: [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]
Subject: Report of Investigation DO-18-0075-I -- Requesting Closure

[REDACTED] Management has reviewed this ROI and has determined that no administrative follow-up action is indicated. Please let me know if you have any questions.

[REDACTED] | Principal Senior Advisor
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Management
Department of the Treasury

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 12:04 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Report of Investigation DO-18-0075-I

Good Afternoon [REDACTED]

Please see the attached Report of Investigation DO-18-0075-I and the Transmittal Memorandum. TIG has requested a written response within 90 days. Thank you.

Very respectfully,

[REDACTED]
Program Analyst, Mission Support, Office of Investigations
Department of the Treasury - Office of Inspector General
Office: [REDACTED]



NOTICE: This electronic message transmission contains information, which may be FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY or subject to the Privacy Act of 1974 (5 U.S.C. 552a). Only authorized persons in the conduct of official government

business may use any of the personal information contained in this correspondence. Any unauthorized disclosure or misuse of personal information may result in criminal and/or civil penalties. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the content of this information is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify me immediately by email and delete the original message.

This message was secured by [ZixCorp](#)^(R).

**REPORT OF INVESTIGATION
DO-18-0075-I**



Office of Inspector General

United States Department of the Treasury



Office of the Inspector General U.S. Department of the Treasury



Report of Investigation

Case Title: Harassing Email
Office of Financial Research

Case #: DO-18-0075-I

Case Type: Criminal ☐
Administrative ☒
Civil ☐

Investigation Initiated: March 13, 2018

Conducted by: [REDACTED]
Special Agent

Investigation Completed: OCT 17 2018

Origin: Office of Financial Research (OFR)

Approved by: [REDACTED]
Special Agent in Charge

Summary

On March 13, 2018, the U.S. Department of the Treasury, Office of Inspector General, Office of Investigations (TIG), initiated an investigation based on a complaint received from the Office of Financial Research (OFR) regarding a potentially threatening email provided to OFR management from contractor, [REDACTED] who works on site.

The investigation determined that the allegation was substantiated; however, the source of the email could not be determined. [REDACTED] did receive an email from an unidentified source that put forth a vague threat while encouraging [REDACTED] to resign from his current position at OFR. (Exhibit 1)

This Report of Investigation is the property of the Office of Investigation, Treasury Office of the Inspector General. It contains sensitive law enforcement information and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission in accordance with 5 U.S.C. S 552. This report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited.

Basis and Scope of the Investigation

On March 13, 2018, the U.S. Department of the Treasury, Office of Inspector General, Office of Investigations (TIG), initiated an investigation based on a complaint received from the Office of Financial Research (OFR) regarding a potentially threatening email provided to OFR management from contractor, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] who works on site. The email header revealed that the email was sent from James Brown via jenneyb22@gmail.com to OFR Contractor [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Department of the Treasury official email address, [REDACTED].

The email [REDACTED] received stated:

"We found something on you. We will spread it all over OFR. You may as well quit now. We have you right where we want you. We will squeeze you tell (sic) you pop" (Exhibit 2)

During the course of the investigation, interviews were conducted with:

- (b) (7)(C) [REDACTED] Director, Office of Security Programs, Treasury
- [REDACTED] IT Specialist, Office of Financial Research (OFR), Treasury
- [REDACTED], Program Manager for Computer World Services (CWS) contracted to Office of Financial Research (OFR), Treasury
- [REDACTED], Guest Services Manager for Fairfield Inn, Germantown, MD

In addition TIG reviewed pertinent documents, including:

- Comcast, subpoena for IP address 50.201.116.20
- Coalfire, subpoena for human resource records about [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
- Highland Technology Services, subpoena for human resource records about [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
- Google, subpoena for email address jenneyb22@gmail.com

Investigative Activity

In an interview with TIG, [REDACTED] stated that after receiving the report of the email threat from [REDACTED], Chief Operating Officer for OFR, she searched her employee records for anyone with the name/resembling the name James Brown. Her search produced too many possible matches. (Exhibit 3)

In an interview with TIG, [REDACTED] stated that he is [REDACTED] direct supervisor for daily Treasury business. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] reports to Computer Worldwide Services (CWS) for time card and salary.

This Report of Investigation is the property of the Office of Investigation, Treasury Office of the Inspector General. It contains sensitive law enforcement information and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission in accordance with 5 U.S.C. § 552. This report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited.

█████ explained that after █████ received the veiled threat via email on February 21, 2018, █████ requested a face to face meeting with █████. That meeting took place on March 7, 2018. During that meeting, █████ stated to █████ that various coworkers with OFR were purposely visiting his work space (the workspace that is described as difficult to get to and is not easily accessible to people) and would peer at █████. █████ also stated to █████ that while waiting for the elevator, OFR employees would whisper "that's him." █████ stated that he was new to OFR and did not know the names of the employees in question. █████ stated that his current work environment made him uncomfortable and he believed that █████ being in a position of power, could do something to █████ the environment.

█████ continued to explain that he told █████ that if the employees were whispering about █████ that it may be due to █████ being the last of 12 contractors hired in OFR. █████ stated that he was not aware of any other employee having a problem with █████.

█████ stated that he reported the meeting to his respective chain of command as well as █████ Counsel for OFR, and █████ Chief Operating Officer (COO) for OFR. █████ stated that █████ instructed █████ to inform █████ that if █████ ever felt unsafe that he should report it to the armed officers located in the lobby of the building and/or physically report to the office of █████. █████ does not know who sent the email. (Exhibit 4)

In an interview with TIG, █████ █████ explained that he started working as an IT contractor in January 2018. He is a contractor with CWS. █████ stated that he does not know who may have sent him the email in question. He stated that after receiving the email, he "sat" on it for one week to "assess" his environment with the hopes of observing an OFR coworker acting strangely and in turn revealing who may have sent the email. █████ stated that he eventually had to stop with his observations because he was becoming "sensitive" to every coworkers gesture and may have been taking every gesture in a negative way.

█████ stated that he only reported the email to OFR because he was instructed by his Program Manager, █████, to do so. █████ stated that he did not want to create "bad blood" while working at the OFR and used the analogy of a gang infested neighborhood to describe OFR. █████ stated that if you lived in a gang infested neighborhood then you would not tell authorities of any wrong doing. You would want to keep quiet to keep the peace.

█████ stated that since reporting the email, the OFR environment has gotten better for him. More of his coworkers are "being more friendly and open" with him. █████ stated that he has no idea why he would be singled out after only working for OFR for approximately six weeks. █████ stated that he has had issues with some of his past contracts with other agencies. █████ was contracted to perform IT functions at the Social Security Administration (SSA) prior to his contract with OFR. While at the SSA, his Project Manager (PM) told █████ to let someone else complete the assigned work because of █████ accent; the PM was unable to understand █████ stated he

This Report of Investigation is the property of the Office of Investigation, Treasury Office of the Inspector General. It contains sensitive law enforcement information and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission in accordance with 5 U.S.C. § 552. This report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited.

spoke with Human Resources at his contracting company and they did not take him seriously. The PM then placed [REDACTED] on a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) and [REDACTED] [REDACTED] title from Senior Cyber Security Specialist to Cyber Security Specialist with, according to [REDACTED] no explanation as to why. [REDACTED] was a contractor at SSA for approximately one year.

[REDACTED] also worked as a contractor for Highland Technology, at the Department of Energy (DOE) for approximately two years. [REDACTED] stated that he was falling behind on his work and the President of Highland wanted to lay [REDACTED] off and put someone else in [REDACTED] place. [REDACTED] stated after this incident he "just left" (resigned). [REDACTED] described the environment with that contract as having too many duties, too many politics, and as being a "crazy environment." In addition to the President wanting [REDACTED] laid off, [REDACTED] immediate manager also wanted [REDACTED] removed from the contract. [REDACTED] stated that he was told by this manager to edit a report. [REDACTED] complied and after the report was sent back with corrections from the customer, [REDACTED] was blamed for the entire report. At that point, Highland laid [REDACTED] off but [REDACTED] left before that was finalized.

[REDACTED] stated that while working as a contractor for Ceridian, contracted to DOD, [REDACTED] received a letter via the U.S. Postal Service. [REDACTED] could not remember exactly what the letter said but recalled the letter stating "go back to Africa." [REDACTED] gave the letter to his manager and to human resources. [REDACTED] could not remember any information about the return address. After this incident, [REDACTED] requested and was granted a transfer to Pennsylvania.

[REDACTED] also stated that he did request a transfer after his incident involving his accent while at SSA. He was not granted the transfer and instead was put on a PIP. (Exhibit 5)

In an interview with TIG, [REDACTED], Program Manager for Computer World Services (CWS) contracted to Office of Financial Research (OFR), Department of the Treasury, explained that she is [REDACTED] Program Manager and oversees his activities while contracted to Treasury. [REDACTED] is factually aware of the occurrences in this investigation to date. [REDACTED] stated that she has spoken with [REDACTED] about the investigation and that [REDACTED] has been clear that he wants to move past the incident. Owens stated that [REDACTED] is new to CWS (as of January 2018) and has not had any other issues thus far. CWS is pleased with his performance. (Exhibit 6)

TIG's investigation revealed the Gmail account, jenneyb22@gmail.com, was created on 02/21/2018 at 09:10:35- Universal Time (UTC). The Gmail account, jenneyb22@gmail.com, was last logged into on 02/21/2018 at 09:11-UTC from IP address: 50.201.116.20. (Exhibit 7)

TIG's investigation revealed IP address, 50.201.116.20, returns to a Fairfield Inn and Suites, 20025 Century Blvd, Germantown, MD 20874. (Exhibit 8)

In an interview with TIG, [REDACTED], Guest Services Manager for Fairfield Inn, 20025 Century Blvd, Germantown, MD 20874, explained that the hotel does have a surveillance system but only

This Report of Investigation is the property of the Office of Investigation, Treasury Office of the Inspector General. It contains sensitive law enforcement information and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission in accordance with 5 U.S.C. § 552. This report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited.

keeps video for 15 days. [REDACTED] stated there is no password required to access the Wi-Fi network. [REDACTED] confirmed that [REDACTED] [REDACTED] did not stay at the Fairfield Inn on February 21, 2018. When presented with a picture of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Tyler did not recognize him. [REDACTED] stated she was working on February 21, 2018 but did not remember anyone loitering. (Exhibit 9)

TIG was contacted by [REDACTED] [REDACTED] who stated that, due to performance issues, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] was terminated from his contract with OFR effective July 16, 2018. (Exhibit 10)

TIG attempted multiple times to ascertain further information from Google, Inc. utilizing multiple investigative means, specifically any stored user information that may be in Google's possession. No new investigative information was found. (Exhibit 11)

Referrals

None.

Judicial Action

None.

Findings

The investigation determined that the allegation was substantiated, however, the source of the email could not be determined. [REDACTED] did receive an email from an unidentified source that put forth a vague threat while encouraging [REDACTED] to resign from his current position at OFR.

Distribution

[REDACTED], Principal Senior Advisor
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Management
Department of the Treasury

Report of Investigation
Case Name: Harassing Email
Case # DO-18-0075-I
Page 6 of 6

Signatures

Case Agent:

[Redacted Signature]

10/5/2018

Date

[Redacted Signature]

10/15/18

Date

This Report of Investigation is the property of the Office of Investigation, Treasury Office of the Inspector General. It contains sensitive law enforcement information and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission in accordance with 5 U.S.C. § 552. This report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited.

Exhibits

1. Complaint to TIG, dated March 13, 2018.
2. Email sent to [REDACTED] [REDACTED] from [jenneyb22@gmail.com], dated February 21, 2018.
3. Memorandum of Activity, Interview of [REDACTED] dated March 22, 2018.
4. Memorandum of Activity, Interview of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] dated March 23, 2018.
5. Memorandum of Activity, Interview of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] dated March 30, 2018.
6. Memorandum of Activity, Interview of [REDACTED], dated April 16, 2018.
7. Memorandum of Activity, Google, Inc. subpoena return for [jenneyb22@gmail.com], dated April 13, 2018.
8. Memorandum of Activity, Comcast subpoena return for IP address 50.201.116.20, dated April 30, 2018.
9. Memorandum of Activity, Interview of [REDACTED] Fairfield Inn, dated May 3, 2018.
10. Email from [REDACTED] [REDACTED] dated July 16, 2018.
11. Memorandum of Activity, Google, Inc. subpoena return for [jenneyb22@gmail.com], dated August 13, 2018.

EXHIBIT 1



**DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY
UNITED STATES MINT
WASHINGTON, DC 20220**

February 22, 2019

[REDACTED]
Special Agent in Charge
U.S. Department of the Treasury
Office of Inspector General
875 15th St. NW
Washington, DC 20005

RE: IG Investigation Referral Allegations of Contractor Misconduct

Dear [REDACTED]

The attached is referred to your office for investigation. In brief, the attachment raises allegations of contractor misconduct including (but not limited to):

1. Potential procurement irregularities such as engaging an individual for support services without authorization and then issuing payment via check without the necessary approvals, and misuse of a tax identification number for the payment of the check.
2. Inappropriate sexual conduct by the United States Mint contractor in question with another individual.
3. Implying to others that he (the contractor) had the authority to make an offer of employment (either with the United States Mint or under his contract).

For additional information regarding this matter, please contact
Commander [REDACTED], Headquarters, United States Mint Police at [REDACTED].

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Attached

Chief
United States Mint Police

Cc: [REDACTED]



EEO COUNSELING - INTAKE INFORMATION



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

On 2/15/19, you made contact with an EEO official.
Month, Day, Year

[Redacted] Cellular No. ()

Your Mailing Address (You must notify the Department of any changes of address while your complaint is pending, or your complaint may be dismissed)

Position Title Independent contractor Series Grade Duty Hours

Employment Status in Relation to this Complaint (Check One)

☒ Applicant ☐ Probationary ☐ Career/Career conditional ☐ Retired (date of retirement)

☐ Former Employee ☐ Other consulting services

2/15/19
Date left United States Mini

Specify

Name and Address of Facility Where You Work

Please select your department: IT

☐ Information Technology ☐ Financial ☐ Office of the Director ☐

☐ Manufacturing ☐ Protection ☐ Sales and Marketing ☐ Solutions

Your Work Telephone No.
()

Your Email Address

Your Supervisor's Name

Supervisor's Telephone No.
()

Supervisor's Position Title

Series

Grade

Duty Hours

Supervisor's Email Address

Prohibited discrimination includes actions taken based on the categories listed below

Check and Particularize Each that Applies

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Race (Specify): | <input type="checkbox"/> 8. Age (Specify Date of Birth): |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Color (Specify): | <input type="checkbox"/> 9. Pregnancy: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Religion (Specify): | <input type="checkbox"/> 10. Genetic Information: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4. Sex (Specify): | <input type="checkbox"/> 11. Sexual Orientation: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 5. National Origin (Specify): | <input type="checkbox"/> 12. Parental Status: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 6. Physical Disability (Specify): | <input type="checkbox"/> 13. Reprisal (Dates of prior EEO Activity): |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 7. Mental Disability (Specify): | |

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Appointment | <input type="checkbox"/> Overtime | <input type="checkbox"/> Retirement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Assignment of Duties | <input type="checkbox"/> Pay | <input type="checkbox"/> Sex Based Harassment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Awards | <input type="checkbox"/> Promotion/Non-selection: (Provide the following) | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Change to Lower Grade | Position Title: <u></u> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sexual Harassment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Classification | Series & Grade: <u></u> | <input type="checkbox"/> Suspension |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Converted to F/T CC | Date you learned of non-selection: <u></u> | <input type="checkbox"/> Termination During Probation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Duty Hours | <input type="checkbox"/> Reasonable Accommodation | <input type="checkbox"/> Time & Attendance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Evaluation-Appraisal Merit Pay | <input type="checkbox"/> Reassignment | <input type="checkbox"/> Training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Evaluation-Appraisal Non-Merit Pay | <input type="checkbox"/> Reinstatement | <input type="checkbox"/> Within Grade Increase |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Exam / Test | <input type="checkbox"/> Removal /Separation | <input type="checkbox"/> Working Conditions |

BRIEFLY describe the incident or action taken against you that you believe was discriminatory. Give the **DATE** when the action occurred. Indicate what **HARM**, if any, came to you in your work as a result of this action.

On 1/17, 20 19, the following occurred: [redacted] led me on to believe

I would have the secretary of the EEO office at the US Mint
Philadelphia location while at the same time telling another woman,
[redacted] she had the position also. [redacted] made
frequent sexual references during in person conversations
and indirectly implied his desire to perform his sexual
aroused process he has been perfecting since his college
years. [redacted] would frequently reference [redacted]
and how he needs to inform her the secretary position
has been filled. I feel he would reference her to imply
if I wanted the job I will have to go along with his
aroused process. Conit on back...

What are you seeking as a resolution to your complaint?

As a result of the lengthy, stressful situation with
[redacted] I am seeking the removal of [redacted]
[redacted] as acting EEO specialist for the US Mint, as
well as being prohibited. Conit on back...

Explain why, based on the factors you cited in Section B, you believe that you were treated differently than other employees or applicants in similar situations.

1. (Name of Comparative Employee) (Factor(s) describing comparative employee, i.e., Race-Black, Sex-Female)

was treated differently than I when:

2. (Name of Comparative Employee) (Factor(s) describing comparative employee, i.e., Race-Black, Sex-Female)

was treated differently than I when:

List the name(s) of the official(s) who took the action which prompted you to seek counseling at this time.

1. <u>[redacted]</u>	2. <u>EEO Contractor</u>
3a. Agency Officials Name	2b. Title, Series and Grade
	3b. Title, Series and Grade

Describe the incident Conf . . .

When I confronted [REDACTED] about such behaviors and how they cannot happen again he began to retaliate against me shortly after. He reportedly asked if he needed to find a reprimand for the 2nd assessment, implied I was not on time for the 1st and claimed I did not follow procedures of the job duties he claimed he expressed on 11/7/19. He attempted to have me agree there was a miscommunication on 11/7/19, I refused to agree to that. After that I sought outside help and contacted this EEO Office. Since 11/7/19 I have been experiencing flare ups of my anxiety, depression, Fibromyalgia, IBS and hemorrhoids. These flare ups have affected my ability to function at work and at home. Some days pain and symptoms are so severe I cannot leave the bathroom, bed or house.

Seeking resolution Conf . . .

From holding any position of power on the Federal, state and local level I am also seeking financial compensation for the emotional and physical aspect I have endured.

On the incident that prompted you to seek EEO counseling, have you:

1. Filed a grievance under the negotiated grievance procedure? ☐ Yes ☒ No If yes, _____ (Date) _____ (Current Status)
- Are you a bargaining unit employee? ☒ Yes ☒ No
3. Filed a grievance under the Agency grievance system? ☐ Yes ☒ No If yes, _____ (Date) _____ (Current Status)
4. Filed an appeal with the Merit Systems Protection Board? ☐ Yes ☒ No If yes, _____ (Date) _____ (Current Status)

You have the right to remain anonymous during the counseling process.

Do you desire anonymity? ☐ Yes ☒ No

You have the right to retain representation of your choice (Check One)

☒ I waive the right to representation at this time. OR ☐ I authorize the person listed below to represent me.

Name of Representative	Representative's title	
Organization	No	Attorney: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
	Telephone No.	Email Address

Mailing Address (Street or P.O. Box, City, State and Zip +4)

Please attach any documentation you wish to submit to support your allegation(s). Include a copy of any written action(s) that caused you to seek counseling at this time.

Note: If you are alleging mental and/or physical disability, it is important for you to submit medical documentation of your disability during the counseling process.

Privacy Act Notice. The collection of this information is authorized by The Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972; 42 U.S.C.2000e-16; PL 95-602 as amended; 5 USC 1303 and 1304; 5 CFR 5.2 and 5.3; 29 CFR 1614.105; the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, as amended 29 U.S.C. 633a; the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, 29 U.S.C. 794a; and Executive Order 11478, as amended. The information supplied will be used to resolve the EEO counseling matter(s) you have raised during counseling. This information may be discussed with designated officers and employees of the Department in order to resolve the matters you have raised.

2/19/19
Date Signed

Thursday 11/29/2018: Providing interpreting services to the US Mint-Philadelphia location through the interpreting agency [REDACTED]. I interpreted a job interview. Those that attended the interview was the [REDACTED] interviewee, his case worker, three department heads as well as the EEO specialist [REDACTED]. When I was leaving the Mint (my shoes were already off), [REDACTED] said that he liked the way I conducted myself while I was interpreting; because of this he wanted to use me in the future for interpreting services. He asked for my business card but I did not have one on me so he went to find a paper and pen to write down his information. I said thank you and left.

Sunday 12/2/18: 9:47 AM: I emailed [REDACTED] the following: "Hello [REDACTED] I hope this email find you well. We met last week. I was the sign language interpreter for an interviewee. It was very nice to have met you. Unfortunately, I was unable to give you my business card but I appreciate the time you took to write down your information for me. If the need should arise in the future for an Interpreter I hope you keep me in mind. I would be happy and extremely grateful to fill the assignment. Thank you so much and have a great day!"

9:49 AM: [REDACTED] responds: "You are extremely welcome. I think you did a great job and seemed to hit it off with the client. You will be my first choice"

8:45 PM: [REDACTED] emails me: "[REDACTED] Have a couple of assignments you might be interested in. The pay is \$1000.00 a session and it will only take approximately 3-4 hours of your time. If interested, give me a call on my work number... [REDACTED] tomorrow morning and I can explain the details."

Monday 12/3/18: I called [REDACTED] and he said he would like to meet in person to discuss the position in more detail. I arranged to meet with him at Starbucks, 1001-1005 Chestnut St 19107.

Tuesday 12/4/18 4PM: I meet with [REDACTED] at the Starbucks. There he explained the consulting for the climate assessments. He explained this in great detail, he even read off all the questions he asks to the audience. He also stated that the pay equated to \$250/hour. From his email from the day before 1000/session at a max of 4 hours does equal \$250/hour. So I agreed to the consulting assignment. During conversation he also mentioned how his detail at the Mint has been extended again. That he will be here for the next 3-5 years and so he will be looking for a secretary for the new EEO office at the Mint.

Another conversation that [REDACTED] brought up was a fight he got into during his first week or so in the city. He said he was walking down a street and saw a man fighting a woman. He intertwined and began to hit the other man. The little girl that was with the woman began to hit [REDACTED] and did so in the penis. During this explanation he kept repeating where the little girl was hitting him.

He also spoke about his wife and how she doesn't have a jealous bone in her body. Which is the opposite of his first wife. I said that my first husband was very jealous as well and it is what ultimately ruined the relationship. He said the same thing happened with him. He continued to emphasize that his current wife is not jealous and gave an example. That if she were to call in the middle of the night and I were to answer his phone in a groggy voice, she wouldn't care. She would just ask to speak with him. And that if she questioned who the woman was he could say that I am the woman next door who had a water leak so he invited her into his bed but he is sleeping on the floor. He said his wife would believe him and would say how kind of a person he is to help out a woman in need.

When leaving Starbucks he insisted he walk me to entrance of the subway and insisted that I text him when I arrive home. When I got home I texted [REDACTED] saying, I'm home. He responded saying, "Glad you made it safely young lady....you don't have to thank you for anything....you earned this opportunity plus I'm really hoping that we can work together for at least the next couple of years. Have a fantastic evening"

Thursday 12/6/19: Text received from [REDACTED] saying, "Good morning [REDACTED] Unfortunately, sorry to report that [REDACTED] won't report to the Mint for another two weeks and as such we don't employ another [REDACTED] employee so we won't need interpreting services for next Tuesday. Good news....the assessment we discussed is definitely on. Plus, I'll be contacting you so to interpreter for [REDACTED] first day and future all hands. If you have any questions at all please don't hesitate to contact me. I'm an open book with my hidden agendas".

I replied, "Afternoon! No problem about next Tuesday. I have you scheduled in my calendar for next month's assessment. For anything else pops up, just let me know. And if you have any questions I will indeed give you a call. Talk with you soon, have a great day!"

Wednesday 1/2/19-Thursday 1/3/19: [REDACTED] and I exchanged a total of 6 emails (Subject: Next week assessments). They consisted of confirmation of the assignment and requests of a security form to be filled out.

Monday 1/7/19: Total of 6 emails (Subject: What can I bring in the building) were exchanged. I inquired what I was allowed to bring into the Mint.

Tuesday 1/8/19 7:02 AM: I arrived at the Mint and the security guard did not know I was coming and he said [REDACTED] was not there yet. I texted [REDACTED] the following, "Morning! I am here. They are going to process me through but will take my phone. Just know I'm here." [REDACTED] came walking through doors and apologized for being late. Right before the first session was to start I expressed interest in the secretary position. I explained to [REDACTED] that I felt I would be good for the position as I have been the record keeper, and secretary for my interpreting and auto mechanic businesses. Another quality I shared with him was my passion for EEO because I am the first biracial child of

my mother's family and because I am light skinned and I was so young when my mother and father split so they all told my brother and I we were Irish and registered us in school with different last names. I also shared with him that my husband was diagnosed with PTSD, anxiety, & depression by the Veteran's Hospital the month before. A consistent income on my end would really lower my husband's stress and symptoms. He said, you know I wish you would have told me this sooner. I came home early from Maryland on Sunday to meet with a woman about the secretary position. But I think you would be a better fit. The session then started.

After the sessions one older vietnam war veteran approached [REDACTED] and inquired about the secretary position. [REDACTED] took the gentleman's information and after he left [REDACTED] looked at me and said, "He wants your job."

[REDACTED] asks if he could take me out to lunch so we could discuss the secretary position. I told him it was late and I needed to go get my children. He then asked if dinner before the next session on 1/10/19 at 5PM. I said sure. He asked where I wanted to go. I said I do not know anything downtown. He had a left over bag from Maggiano's he had brought in with him that morning. He said how about here. I said sure.

Again, [REDACTED] insisted to walk me out of the Mint and to my destination, whether it be my car or subway. His explanation for this was because this way if anything happened to me he would be able to tell my husband the he saw me go down the subway or what have you. On the walk he mentioned the other woman he had a business dinner with on Sunday. I said, you know I feel bad but I think I will be great at the position and I will learn whatever I need to. He agreed with me. He also told me that he met her on a train ride one day. That on the train he never likes to talk to people but for over an hour he talked with this woman and they really hit it off. That her name was [REDACTED] and she is the lead singer in a band, [REDACTED]. He walked me to the parking garage door where we went our separate ways. Though before he insisted that I text him when I get home. I did.

Thursday 1/10/19: I parked at the same garage I parked at on 1/8/19. I walked to Maggiano's restaurant where [REDACTED] was waiting for me. During dinner I asked many questions about the secretary position. What the pay was, the hours, job duties and tuition reimbursement programs as I would want to take advantage of that so I can afford law school. He said the pay was 38K/yea (I told him this was a pay cut for me as I made 42k in 2017); hours were 8 ½ hours a day, I could arrived anytime between 6AM-8:30AM; lunch was ½; but I could work one day a week from home; duties included answering phones, setting up power points for presentations [REDACTED] has to do, & setting up presentations for black history month, hispanic heritage month, etc. He said the position would be through his agency for the first year. At which point I would be able to transfer into a federal position at the Mint. He continued saying that he would teach me everything I need to know so I could apply for an EEO position after he left. He stated that although it would be competitive that if I listened to everything he said I would be the

most qualified for the position. He asked me to email him a copy of my resume as so he could tweak it up a bit to better fit the secretary position criteria. He stated that he would keep me up to date on all things related to the position. He continued to say that he would use the word abreast, though has noticed that with some women when he would use the word abreast they instantly cover their breasts, even though he was not talking about their breast. I told him that I'm ok hearing and using that word.

When the waitress came I ordered a ceasar salad, he did the same except added shrimp and chicken.

The conversation turned into how women can be treated so negatively. I agreed and gave examples of what I have been going through since opening up my auto mechanic shop with my husband. He chimed in and said that he understood and that it boggles his mind how people look at him oddly when he walks down the street with a woman younger than himself. He said it happened when we walked in and that it is highly possible it will happen when we leave. People see him with a younger woman and they automatically assume we are together and will give us nasty looks.

When leaving the restaurant and on the walk home I asked [REDACTED] if LGBT is represented in the mint. He said I do not know data like that is not kept but if they they came to us they have rights like everyone else. Why do you ask? I told him because i was bi sexual. He was shocked and extremely excited as he said he never met a bi person before. He asked me some questions such as when did I first know, was is confusing and then told me a story of when he was at freshman orientation in college.

He said the fellow who was presenting, [REDACTED], told all the females not to come to college expecting to find a husband. You'll get pregnant and they'll leave you. Then he made an announcement to the men saying not to come to college looking for a wife. All that will happen is you'll get her pregnant and you'll have to drop out of school. He went further to say to the men, don't think you boys know anything about sex and how to please a woman anyway; so just pay attention to your studies. [REDACTED] said all the men took offense to that because they all thought they knew what they were doing even though if they were like him they were all virgins. ([REDACTED] emphasized this point by repeating it a couple of time before continuing his story). [REDACTED] continued to tell the men the secret to love making is to love the woman from head to toe. On the first time, to start at the womans head and work your way to her feet and her body will let you know what she does and doesn't like.

[REDACTED] said he tried it and saw that it worked. He said that it was like an experiment each time he was with a different woman. He kept this research going and made a name for himself around campus. He said women would just show up to his dorm room saying I bet your ways won't work on me. He gave a detailed story about a girl who had a boyfriend came to his dorm room wanting to know if the rumors were true but didn't want to cheat on her boyfriend. He said that's the best part, i don't need to have sex with you.

I bet that I can turn you on so much that you're going to scream stop. He said that's exactly what happened. (Mr. [REDACTED] started shaking his body showing me how this girl shook and jumped off his bed. He said that she said he couldn't continue any more or else she wouldn't be able to control herself.

He said this theory of his worked out great for him because he is not good a rejection. Always was that way and always will be. Just a fault he has, one of his insecurities and fears is to put himself out there to a woman and not have it be reciprocated. Told me he would be devastated if to woman looked at him and told him is wasn't good enough. He brought up his wife natural nature to trust him sometimes makes him feel unwanted. Saying he told his wife once, "Now woman don't you make me feel as if no other woman but you wants me!"

He said his insecurities are why he never made the first move on a woman. So much so that his wife first thought that he was gay because he wouldn't make the first move. He continued with his story and said he kept data on these trails of turning women on and used this data for his thesis senior year, he's professor was [REDACTED]. He proposed that it didn't matter who it was touching you that if you touched the body in the right way the body would respond no matter who was touching you. It wouldn't matter if they were a man, woman, black, white, old, young, etc. He said he received an A on the thesis.

He continued to talk about how this process worked for him when he left college too. He told me a story of when he was on a long train ride a crying women came and sat next to him. He said he told her about [REDACTED] and the process. She told him she did not believe him and wanted him to prove it. She took him back to her sleeping car where he did his process to her and it worked.

We went into the Mint and did the 3rd shift assessment. Afterwards he insisted to walk me to the parking garage and this time he requested a car ride home. I got into my vehicle and I drove him to his apartment; dropped him off out front. On the car ride he mentioned the other women [REDACTED] that she needs to tell her that she does not have the position. He insisted that I let him know when I got home. When I arrived home I forgot to text him.

Friday 1/11/19: 12:14AM [REDACTED] texted saying, "I'm beginning to get a little worried now...are you okay?"

12:37 AM I replied, "No, don't worry. I'm home. Took me a bit longer to get home, a lot of streets were blocked off due to construction and I was excited and just started walking with my husband, sorry. Have a good night and get some please."

6:36AM I text [REDACTED] "That was supposed to say sleep....I hope you're not upset with me. Enjoy your weekend and I'll talk with you on monday!"

6:54AM he responded, "I knew what you meant...not upset....just relieved that you made it home safely....another possible fault of mine is that I'm very overprotective. Thanks again for assisting with that very important initiative. You totally exceeded my expectations. I'm glad you are considering ht Mint as a possible place of employment. I think you can have a great future in this field. If you haven't changed your mind after hearing me talk in all those employee sessions please work on your resume this weekend and if need any advice I'm just a phone call or text away. I'm still excited about my first new friend."

9:53 AM I responded, "Hahaha! You and the employees at the Mint convinced me and I am very excited to get started. In the fall I accepted an ongoing assignment at a school in Camden, NJ in a multi disability classroom. The teacher in the room was rude, talked down to the children, neglected all the children's academic needs especially those with lower functioning. I took notes and reported what I say in the classroom. Unfortunately, I had to remove myself from the assignment because I did all I could do. My position did not allow me the authority to see that this oppression was stopped. I am extremely happy to be given the opportunity to learn how to hold these kinds of people accountable and create a positive environment for people to thrive and feed sae. I will not let you down [REDACTED] I'm going to learn everything I can from you.

10:08 AM: [REDACTED], "I am totally sold. You will be great".

Saturday 1/12/19 2:55 PM: I receive a text from [REDACTED] "I didn't forget my new first time friend I spoke with my contractor CEO yesterday and she's ready to move on the positions (great news). She said that all I have to do is clear is with the agency head in DC and we can finalize the deal. Fortunately, I have a great reputation with him so no problems are anticipate at all...by the way, you will learn that whatever you share with me about anything will always stay between us...that percent true.

3:07 PM: I replied, "You're too funny with your emojis! The sunglass guy goes along with your ringtone....bad to the bone! Haha! That's great news! I'm working on my resume currently. I'll have it in your inbox by tomorrow. When should I expect the position to start? I appreciate your discretion with our conversations. And if you have any questions feel free to ask.

3:12 PM: [REDACTED] replied, "I really gonna push this so we can get you on board within the first two weeks of next month. I promise you I will put you in a place where you can have a great career and not just a job. You may want to rethink that invite for questions though, I told you that you're my first of first and i've therefore have a lot of unanswered questions"

3:19 PM: I replied, Awesome! As soon as you know a date let me know so I can inform my agency of my last day. And don't worry about the questions, they might be funny and make me laugh.

3:21 PM: [REDACTED] replied, "I'm good at making people laugh....I use it to balance my insecurities. I'm sitting here working on the report now and I plan to have it available for your review and hopefully your concurrence by Tuesday close of business.

3:30 PM: I replied, "Sounds good. I can do that. But stop working and enjoy your weekend."

3:38 PM: [REDACTED] replied, Can't and that's why I desperately need help...do me a favor and enjoy yours enough for the both of us but remember in order to do that you have to incorporate me in your thought a couple of times (at least) and think..."this is for [REDACTED]

3:40 PM: I replied, "Positive vibes...you got it...currently in transit.

Sunday 1/13/19 10:45 AM: I emailed [REDACTED] the following, Good morning, Attached you will find my resume. If there is anything else you may need from me please let me know. I'll be on the lookout for the report to go a start on that. Enjoy the rest of your weekend!

11:07 AM: [REDACTED] replied the following, "It's a really good start. I'll probably begin to fine tune on Tuesday and have ready by Thursday. We have a snow storm here and I'm hoping that I can still catch my train tonight but it's beginning to look like tomorrow which is really throwing me off. When I finish I will provide you with both, a hard copy (to personally discuss changes) and a electronic copy so you can submit. Give me a call on Tuesday and hopefully we can make arrangements. I'm still excited because I think you will be great. I guess I also need to have a conversation with the other candidate on either Tuesday or Wednesday..."

3:48 PM: I replied, "Thanks! I can definitely meet up with you Thursday. Be safe traveling about in all that snow. It's not snowing up here, at least not yet. Fingers crossed it stays away from Philly. Talk with you soon and by the way, I'm very excited too!"

Monday 1/14/19 7:24 AM: [REDACTED] emailed (Subject: Resume) me the following, "[REDACTED] I have no idea as to how but your résumé disappeared from my computer...could you send it to both my personal and work email... thanks"

8:02 AM: I replied the following, "Oh no! Attached you'll find a copy of my resume. I can certainly send one to your work email, can I have that again. I know you gave it to me before but I think I wrote it down wrong."

8:41 AM: I texted [REDACTED] a link to a Macklemore and Ryan Lewis song, Same Love; and I said, "This song came on the radio this morning. I love it! I thought I'd share it with you.

8:54 AM: Mr. [REDACTED] replied, Thanks...that a truly powerful song with awesome lyrics. Although I am straight as an arrow and have tons of questions. I definitely support anyone's right to choose their preference. You are going to be so much fun to work with. Of, the conversations we will have. I look forward to being enlightened more. Again thanks for sharing.

10:32 AM: I texted [REDACTED] saying, "Questions, [REDACTED] Does the federal government have any kind of tuition reimbursement program for their employees?"

1:18 PM: Mr. [REDACTED] replies, "It depends...let's talk specifics when we meet up."

1:27 PM: I replied, "That works." I thought [REDACTED] would reply saying where and when he wanted to meet up. Since he did not I decided to text him the next day.

8:09 PM: [REDACTED] emailed (Subject: Resume) the following, "I just forwarded what you just sent but for future reference my work email is [REDACTED]"

Tuesday 1/15/19: 12:42 PM: I texted [REDACTED] "Happy Tuesday! What day would you like to meet up? I am available Wednesday afternoon into the evening and Thursday later morning and afternoon. What works for you?"

1:07 PM: [REDACTED] replied, Either do you wanna do lunch or dinner while we discuss your employment...additionally I received great news today".

1:07 PM: I replied, Ooo really, do tell. Let's do lunch. Have you ever been to Panera bread?"

1:12 PM: [REDACTED] In dc not Philadelphia"

1:16 PM: I replied, "well If you like them, there is one on 12th st we could meet at. Or did you want to meet somewhere else?"

1:50 PM: [REDACTED] replied, "Panera will be fine....can we do Thursday"

2:33 PM: I replied, "Thursday it is, time preference?"

2:38 PM: [REDACTED] replied, "what works best for you?"

3:18 PM: I replied, "Hows noon sound?"

3:29 PM: "Sounds good to me"

3:49 PM: I replied, "I'm excited! It's my birthday on thursday and my husband is taking me out to breakfast before his appointment, i'll enjoy some Panera for lunch with you and i'll get to hear your exciting news."

4:07 PM: [REDACTED] replied, "Coincidence...my birthday is on Friday."

4:20 PM: I replied, "Hal Too funny".

Thursday 1/17/19: I met up with [REDACTED] for lunch. Since I knew it was his birthday I bought him a butter cake and gave it to him when I arrived Panera. I thought I was going to be there for a hour; eat, talk business, small talk and then I'd be on my way. I told him i was downtown with my husband and he just took an uber home so i could have this meeting. He said you could have brought him, i said no that's alright as this is business.

We ordered our food and found a table. When the food was ready I got up to get it. When I walked passed [REDACTED] I saw him looking at me. When I returned with the food and sat down he said, you know jeans are not very flattering on you. They hide your shape. I can see the shape of your legs better in those tights. I didn't know what to say. I just started at him. He said, "that was supposed to be a compliment".

When the food arrived. [REDACTED] made a negative comment about the food. I agreed and how disappointed I was because I remember Panera being better than that. He then states that I could have had lobster and steak but that I wanted this. I told him that I didn't need all that and this was fine.

Most of the conversation at lunch was about his process he had learned and perfected from [REDACTED]. Although he did not explicitly say he wanted me to go to his place, it was greatly implied. He talked about how during his process I wouldn't need to take my clothes off during the first stage, although some articles of clothing would need to be removed to gain access to certain erogenous zones, such as the elbow and feet. That he wouldn't kiss me on the lips at first because he starts off from behind kissing the back of the neck, (all of this is mainly manual movements across his face showing these locations while he says, here, then here, etc) around the side of the neck, the ear, the cheek, forehead, the other side of the face, before even going near the mouth. He said, "I like to take a while before I even kiss your lips. He began to discuss the other stages of his process.

This is when I zoned out. I was extremely uncomfortable and I couldn't believe I was in this kind of situation. I knew I needed to say something but I just kept thinking about what he said about his fear of rejection. I know the whole time i was just nodding, signaling i was listening to what he was saying, I didn't know what to say. Eventually I thought of something, i said, you know you should write a blog, or a book, i'm sure a lot of young men would love to read this. He said he wouldn't do that, that everyone else would do it wrong, they wouldn't know how to do it like him. They would all think they got it. They would mess it up. He then says how he always wanted to his process on a woman like myself but a full lesbian. He also made mention to how if there was a man

sitting next to me, (and he made a gesture to the empty seat to my right) that he wouldn't even be saying these things.

He stopped talking about his because a beggar woman came up to us and requested some money for some food. I recognized this woman from the Wawa near my house. I would buy her a cream cheese, not toasted bagel. [REDACTED] gave her \$5 and she left. I am so thankful that woman showed up as after she left the conversation now shifted to business at the Mint. He handed me my resume which he had added things to. He also handed me a copy of the assessment report for me to look over. I said I would read it over, sign it and have it back to him. He said that there was no need for me to sign it so don't worry about that.

Upon leaving he said that he did not want to receive a call from me next week saying that my husband won't let me work for that pervy old man. I told him that wouldn't happen. He insisted that he walk me back to my vehicle. On the walk there he made comment again about the other woman [REDACTED] and how he still needs to tell her that I have the secretary position and she does not. I was confused as he had previously told me he was going to have this conversation with her but I didn't say anything about the [REDACTED] comment. He continued saying that since I have more experience he is going to give me 40K/year for the secretary position, as 38k/year is what he was offering [REDACTED]

6:30 PM: [REDACTED] texted me the following, "Thanks so much for the cake...ate some and it was delicious...and once again happy birthday to you...hope you enjoy your family and the ice cream"

6:44 PM: I replied, "Yay, I'm glad you enjoyed it! It makes up for the horrible sandwiches at lunch. Happy birthday to you too! Enjoy your weekend".

Wednesday 1/23/19 10:20 AM: I emailed (Subject: [REDACTED] Interpreting) [REDACTED] the following, "Good Morning, Attached you will find my invoice for the services I provided 1/8/19 & 1/10/19 as well as a W-9 form. Unfortunately, I do not want to use paypal to receive payments as I do not want to pay the fee. If there is a direct deposit form I could fill out that would be a great option. If that is not available a check will be fine. That can be remitted to the address on the W-9. Thank you and talk with you soon, [REDACTED]"

11:37 AM: [REDACTED] replied, "Good morning [REDACTED] I thought we agreed upon 1200 1000 total for the two sessions and 200 miscellaneous, e.g., parking, meals, etc"

11:57 AM: I replied the following, "Hello, When we spoke in person you said \$250/hour. Though when I added up the hours and did all the math it came to be over \$3,000. I knew that was too much so I went back into our emails. There I saw your quote of \$1,000 per session. That is where I came up with my sum total. Though I am fine with renegotiating at \$500 and session plus misc expenses incurred. I will re send the invoice reflecting these changes."

12:53 PM: [REDACTED] did not respond but I replied with the following, "Afternoon, I attached the revised invoice. Let me know if there is anything else you may need. Thanks, [REDACTED]"

12:54 PM: I emailed (Subject:Resume) [REDACTED] the following, "Afternoon, I will get you my revised resume by this evening. Thanks!"

9:09 PM: [REDACTED] did not respond but I replied with the following, "Good evening, As promised, I have attached my revised resume. If there is anything else you may need from me for the application process please let me know. Thanks and talk with you soon." [REDACTED] never responded to this email.

Saturday 1/27/19 9:13 PM: [REDACTED] text me the following, "Hope everything is well my new friend. I will try to call you tomorrow and give you an update....I'm supposed to meet with [REDACTED] tomorrow morning...not looking forward to that"

Sunday 1/28/19 7:30 AM: I replied to [REDACTED] text message from the night before with the following, "Good Morning [REDACTED] I will be anticipating your call, though I need to clear some things with you. The conversation on my birthday was extremely uncomfortable for me. I'm bringing this up because if I am to work under you I need you to understand that I do not wish to have those kinds of conversations. I would like to keep our relationship professional and business only. A quality about me, which I think is extremely beneficial in this field, is my ability to be friendly with others yet not be their friend. I am willing to apply myself to the fullest and learn everything you have to offer. I believe you possess an enormous amount of wisdom and I will do my best to retain what you share. In conclusion, it is important for me that you understand my perspective and what I expect from here on forward; if we are to work together for the next five years. Again, I will be anticipating your call and I hope we have an understanding. Talk with you soon"

7:54 AM: [REDACTED] replied the following, "Totally understand and respectful. Thanks for handling in such a professional manner...will never happen again and that you have my word. I totally respect you as a family person, a woman of integrity and a great new employee prospect. Again, thanks for the feedback and you were offended by any part of any conversation I am truly deeply sorry.

8:02 AM: I replied, "Thank you for such a respectful response. I truly appreciate it"

9:35 AM: [REDACTED] texted the following, " Let me know when you're available for me to call."

9:40 AM: I replied, "I had a cancellation this morning so I am available now."

██████ called me shortly after i sent the text message. On the phone he again apologize if i felt uncomfortable. He did not explicitly state what exact part of any conversation he was apologizing for but he said that he would never happen again. He wanted to let me know how and why he was looking for a secretary position is such an informal manner. He said that the position was posted on the federal jobs.gov website but that no one qualified in the philadelphia area applied. So that is why he began his search for a secretary. He asked if i was still interested in doing the consulting. I said yes and that i was still looking forward to the secretary position as well. He did not mention the secretary position but said that i am not his first choice for the consulting but his only choice. I told him as long as we are in agreement that our relationship is professional and business i would still consult and continued with the secretary. He said of course and that he would be in contact with me in the near future. I said ok and we hung up.

Monday 1/28/19 1:51 PM: ██████ text me the following, "Good afternoon young lady, i think i have a couple of good news pieces for you...1) if you will be kind enough to send me your tax id number i can get a check for you by wednesday latest...2) if you are free February 19-21...i have a \$1,600 job (assessment)...the hours will be 7:30 AM-11:30 AM on the 19th...3PM-7PM on the 20th and 8PM-midnight on the 21st. If you noticed, i included four hundred more dollars because there are three different shifts for this one and not two like the last one. If you can do it...great...if not, i understand but can you let me know soonest because if you cannot i need to find someone who can assist. Thanks for your consideration."

3:49 PM: i replied, "Afternoon! Those days and times are good for me. i'll put them in my calendar now. As for my tax id, i only have one for ██████ p, all other services use my social. That's on my W-9 i sent over to you. Will that not work?"

4:29 PM: Mr. ██████ replied, "Is it possible that we can use the ██████ tax id"

4:29 PM: ██████

5:29 PM: ██████ replied, "Thanks so much i'll let you know when i have your check...it shouldn't take longer than this Wednesday"

5:41 PM: i replied, "Great! Thank you!"

Tuesday 1/29/19 11:57 AM: ██████ text me the following, "i've got your check...how do you want to do this?"

6:03 PM: Hey, sorry, crazy day today. Can we meet up Thursday afternoon? Say 330 outside the Mint? i meant 12:30, sorry.

6:14 PM: ██████ replies, "Yes ma'am".

Thursday 1/31/19 11:31 AM: I texted [REDACTED] the following, "I'll be there at 12:30. Should I get buzzed into the check in area and you meet me there?"

1:02 PM: I texted [REDACTED] the following, "Hey I didn't hear from you and didn't want to make the drive down town in this weather without confirming with you. Could you please drop it in the mail for me before you leave for MD?"

1:13 PM: [REDACTED] replied, "I'm still here...I responded "yes ma'am" to your request for 12:30 today...went downstairs and almost froze waiting for you to pull up

1:13 PM: I replied, "Ooo no! I didn't want either of us to freeze that's why I texted at 11:30"

1:17 PM: [REDACTED] replied, "Was in a meeting and therefore didn't get your 11:30 text but was fully prepared to keep my word and meet you a 12:30 out front"

1:21 PM: I replied, "So sorry, not my intention to have you freezing. So you don't have o face the cold for me again, could you mail it?"

2:07PM: "It's your call but it has been my experience that if something is lost in the mail its' the government's policy to wait 30-45 days before reissuing another check to ensure the first check wasn't cashed. Your call."

2:19 PM: I replied, "I understand. Thank you for letting me know. I'll take my chances though"

3:56 PM: I texted [REDACTED] the following, [REDACTED], in case you don't have it handy"

Friday 2/1/18 10:28 AM: [REDACTED] texted me the following, "Good morning [REDACTED] I tried to text you yesterday with a question but my phone kept saying the message not delivered...found out later that's what happens when your wife forgets to pay the bill...anyway [REDACTED] secretary) filled out a envelope with your address on it and I wasn't sure if it was right so I was scared to send the check without verifying the address was correct. Here's a picture of the envelope and if you will be kind enough to let me know the address is correct I will send off your check first thing Monday morning."

10:29 AM: I replied, "Oo you're having that kind of day...so sorry but I know how it is. The address is perfect. Thank you so much."

10:30 AM: Mr. [REDACTED] replied, "It will be sent first thing Monday morning and I apologize for any inconvenience"

10:32 AM: I replied, "No worries. It's all good. Thank you, enjoy your weekend. Hope the weather doesn't give you any trouble on your way home."

I feel [REDACTED] retaliated against me here. I think he was not happy that I wanted to me in the lobby of the Mint and that is why he did not respond to my message. I also think because I would not come and meet him that he purposely waited til Monday morning to mail the check.

Monday 2/4/19 2:47 PM: [REDACTED] texted me the following, "Check mailed."

2:59 PM: I replied, "Thank you!"

Wednesday 2/6/19 5:05 PM: I texted [REDACTED] the following, "Received the check. Thanks again."

6:30 PM: [REDACTED] texted me the following, [REDACTED] Thanks for letting me know...I get a little nervous handling people's money via mail but I am glad it worked out...couple questions...1. Did you read the report...and 2. Are you still available to assist with the second one scheduled for later this month...just checking because if something has come up and you can't, i need time to explore a plan B."

7:41 PM: I replied, "Yes and yes, sir"

Saturday 2/9/19: I was feeling uneasy about the whole situation. So I google searched [REDACTED] [REDACTED], the other woman Mr. [REDACTED] was saying was up for the secretary position. I found a facebook page. The girl is [REDACTED] Same as myself. I instantly felt sick to my stomach but knew I needed to call the phone number on the facebook page. It was [REDACTED] father. He expressed concern about [REDACTED] as well. Saying that he did not approve of [REDACTED] unorthodox hiring practices. I spoke with [REDACTED] and she was shocked to hear I was being told I have the secretary position as she is being told the same. She also expressed certain occasions when [REDACTED] said inappropriate things to her also.

Tuesday 2/12/19 2:35 PM: [REDACTED] texted me the following, "Good afternoon [REDACTED] Just checking to make sure everything is fine with next week...the assessment will start Tuesday morning at 7:30 so I will need you to be here by 7:10 at the latest...Tuesday sessions will last from 7:30 am until 11:30 am...Wednesday sessions will ast from 3 pm until 7 pm and thursday sessions will start at 9:30 PM and conclude approximately 11:30 pm. If you can still make it...great. However if you can't will you be kind enough to let me know ASAP so I can get a replacement. Again, you should prepare your arrival for 20-30 minutes before the start time each of the three days. This time around please read the report NLT2 days after receipt to confirm concurrence or opposition (with written explanation). The preceding didn't transpire as discussed for the last assessment."

8:06 PM: I replied, "Yes, I'll be there. And just to be clear you did not request a confirmation after i read the first report."

8:14 PM: [REDACTED], "I most certainly did. But we will just consider it unfortunate miscommunication...the whole reason why you took notes was two fold... (1) to discuss controversial issues after each session if any existed but none did...and (2) when you got a copy of the report you could compare your notes to see if what I wrote in the report was reflective of what you wrote in your notes. We even discussed this at Panera bread when we last had lunch but like i said we will attribute this to miscommunication"

8:28 PM: I replied, "I believe communication was received loud and clear that day in panera...upon receiving the report I said I would read it, have it signed within a few days and returned to you and your reply was no rush as you did not require my signature. If there was indeed a deadline I would of had done by that day."

8:31 PM: [REDACTED] replied, "Not going to debate with you...we have difference of opinion as to what transpired so I'll put together a statement of work for this job and then we'll both have it in writing"

8:31 PM: I replied, "Sounds good."

This repeated inquiry about my consulting services; the attempt to have me agree that there was a miscommunication at Panera; also well as his attempt to make it seem as if I was late to the first assessment and did not send noticed when report was read; as well as his constant remarks about the other woman up for the secretary position was really starting to add up that this was all not ok and definitely not an isolated incident. This is when I decided to contact lawyers. I also attempted to contact the superintendent to the Philadelphia Mint but her phone number is not listed on the website, finally I found the EEO office in Washington DC. I did not sign any agreement with a lawyer.

Friday 2/15/19: I filed a complaint with [REDACTED] of the US Mint EEO office- headquarters in Washington, DC.

I contemplated all weekend about if I should do the next assessment. I could really use the money but I thought about how quiet and alone it can be on the upper floors of the plant. I thought about [REDACTED] stories about his boxing career. I thought that one hit I would be down and it's not possible no one would be around to hear anything. I did not feel comfortable going. But I felt relieved that now I have a process to follow to make sure [REDACTED] can not do this again to another young woman.

2/19/19 8:13 AM: [REDACTED] text me the following, [REDACTED] what happened? The assessment started today"

8:20 AM: I replied, "I contacted the EEO in DC on Friday and finally found guidance on this situation. Someone will be in contact with you soon."

8:26 AM: [REDACTED] replied, "I wish you would have let me know ma'am."

EXHIBIT 2



MEMORANDUM OF ACTIVITY



Case Number: USM-19-0017-P	Reporting Office: Investigations	Type of Activity: Interview - Victim
Date of Activity: February 25, 2019	Date Report Drafted: February 28, 2019	Location of Activity: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Subject of Activity: [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]		Activity Conducted By (Name(s) and Title(s)): [REDACTED] SA [REDACTED]

On February 25, 2019, the Department of the Treasury, Office of Inspector General, Office of Investigations (TIG) interviewed [REDACTED] Independent Contractor, United States Mint (USM) Philadelphia, PA regarding her being sexually harassed by [REDACTED], Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Counselor, Contractor, USM after promising her employment with the USM.

[REDACTED] stated that she met [REDACTED] on November 29, 2018, when she provided [REDACTED] interpretation for a job applicant with the USM. [REDACTED] was a contract employee of [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] asked her for her contact information and told her that he liked how she conducted herself in the interview process and that he had a position opening for a Secretary, assisting him with conducting EEO climate surveys at the USM and paid about \$1000 for a few hours work. [REDACTED] stated that she had no background in this type of work, however, [REDACTED] was impressed with how she handled herself. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] worked for a [REDACTED] called Procurevis Agency located in Maryland and that [REDACTED] was detailed to Philadelphia for the next 3-5 years.

[REDACTED] stated that she met with [REDACTED] on a few occasions for lunch and coffee so that he could help her tweak her resume for the position he anticipated having in his newly formed EEO office at the USM. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] told her that the Union President had stepped down from the Union and was moving into the EEO position and that since the former president was a white guy and she was a female, she would help balance out the office. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] told her the secretary position would be a contractor job for the first year and then convert to a federal job after that. [REDACTED] stated that she never completed a job application,

This report contains sensitive law enforcement material and is the property of the Office of Inspector General. It may not be copied or reproduced without written permission from the Office of Inspector General. This report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. Its disclosure to unauthorized persons is strictly prohibited and may subject the disclosing party to liability. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. §§ 552, 552a.

MEMORANDUM OF ACTIVITY

Case Number. USM-19-001 7-P	Subject of Activity (Brief Description). [REDACTED]	Date of Activity. February 25, 2019
--------------------------------	--	--

completed an interview or saw a job description. Herrera stated that [REDACTED] told her that her resume was her application and that he was the hiring manager. [REDACTED] stated that she completed 1 assessment for the USM EEO Climate Survey over a 2 day period January 8 and January 10, 2019. [REDACTED] stated that she requested [REDACTED] to pay her with a W-9 as an independent contractor, but that he requested a Tax ID # for her business. [REDACTED] stated that all she had was an EIN # for her [REDACTED] business and provided [REDACTED] with the following: EIN # [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] state that she was paid \$1000 plus \$200 for expenses.

[REDACTED] stated that after the assessments she met [REDACTED] for lunch and he began to tell her inappropriate stories about how he learned to please a woman while he was in college and that he wrote his senior thesis on pleasing women and his "Erection process". [REDACTED] stated that she later confronted [REDACTED] on his inappropriate conversation with her and he apologized and stated that it was just a misunderstanding. [REDACTED] then asked [REDACTED] if she was going to continue to do the consulting work and accept the secretary position.

[REDACTED] stated that she became suspicious because [REDACTED] told her that there was another woman who wanted the position as well and her name was [REDACTED] s. [REDACTED] stated that she became suspicious and contacted [REDACTED] after locating her on Facebook. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] told her that [REDACTED] had offered her the job as well and had been meeting her at restaurants and helping her with her resume as well. [REDACTED] stated that she felt [REDACTED] was trying to string her along about the position until it was too late to file a harassment complaint against him, so she filed the EEO complaint as has had no contact with [REDACTED] since January 17, 2019. [REDACTED] provide TIG with copies of Attachments 1-6.

Attachments:

- 1) Copies of emails from [REDACTED]
- 2) Copies of text messages from [REDACTED]
- 3) Copy of the EEO Climate Survey Report
- 4) Copy of Invoice and Check for Services
- 5) Copy of Original Resume
- 6) Copy of Revised Resume by [REDACTED]

This report contains sensitive law enforcement material and is the property of the Office of Inspector General. It may not be copied or reproduced without written permission from the Office of Inspector General. This report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. Its disclosure to unauthorized persons is strictly prohibited and may subject the disclosing party to liability. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. §§ 552, 552a.

Date Printed: 4/4/19
OI Form-09 (11/01)

Office of Inspector General – Investigations
Department of the Treasury

EXHIBIT 3



MEMORANDUM OF ACTIVITY



Case Number: USM-19-0017-P	Reporting Office: Investigations	Type of Activity: Interview - Victim
Date of Activity: February 26, 2019	Date Report Drafted: February 28, 2019	Location of Activity: 1201 Market St. Philadelphia, PA 19107
Subject of Activity: [REDACTED]		Activity Conducted By (Name(s) and Title(s)): [REDACTED] SA [REDACTED]

On February 26, 2019, the Department of the Treasury, Office of Inspector General, Office of Investigations (TIG) interviewed [REDACTED] Civilian, regarding her being offered employment with the USM by [REDACTED] Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Counselor, Contractor, USM.

[REDACTED] stated that on November 18, 2018, she met [REDACTED] on the train home from visiting her boyfriend in Washington, DC. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] was headed back to Philadelphia from his home in Maryland, for work. [REDACTED] stated that they had a very pleasant, friendly conversation, over which she had mentioned that she recently experienced multiple job interviews with very bad companies and was running out of money, rapidly. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] mentioned that he was one of fifteen hiring managers in his company (the Mint) and they were looking to fill an Administrative Assistant position. [REDACTED] asked her to send him her résumé, if she would be interested. [REDACTED] stated that she told [REDACTED] that she was interested, at which point [REDACTED] gave her his government e-mail address and his work and cell number. [REDACTED] reached her destination, shook hands with [REDACTED] and departed. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] asked her to text him that she got home safely. [REDACTED] stated that she did text him when she got home and then sent him her résumé the next morning.

[REDACTED] stated that the following day she met [REDACTED] at 8 PM to discuss her résumé that he had offered to re-write it for her. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] asked her where she would be comfortable meeting. [REDACTED] told [REDACTED] that she would meet him at a Starbucks Coffee location, and asked him to send her the address of the Starbucks that was closest to where he was staying. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] sent her an

This report contains sensitive law enforcement material and is the property of the Office of Inspector General. It may not be copied or reproduced without written permission from the Office of Inspector General. This report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. Its disclosure to unauthorized persons is strictly prohibited and may subject the disclosing party to liability. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. §§ 552, 552a.

MEMORANDUM OF ACTIVITY

Case Number USM-19-0017-P	Subject of Activity (Brief Description): [REDACTED]	Date of Activity: February 25, 2019
------------------------------	--	--

address but it was not Starbucks. [REDACTED] stated that she later Googled the address that [REDACTED] sent and found that it was AKA Washington Square (834 Chestnut St., Philadelphia 19107), the apartment building in which [REDACTED] stays during the week for his job.

[REDACTED] stated that she did eventually meet [REDACTED] at a Starbucks near his apartment and that the Starbucks was open for at least another hour, but [REDACTED] insisted that they go somewhere else to talk. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] asked her what kind of food she liked, and she mentioned Italian food and they walked to Maggiano's Little Italy on Filbert Street. [REDACTED] stated that they talked about the résumé over a few brief spurts of conversation, but the conversation mostly consisted of his job as a security guard at the Capitol Theatre, working with the band Parliament Funkadelic. [REDACTED] stated that after dinner, [REDACTED] walked her to her car and noticed that she had a \$31.00 parking ticket (Citation [REDACTED]). [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] picked the ticket up, physically withheld it from her and insisted that he would pay for it (just as he demanded to pay for both of their meals at Maggiano's). [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] told her that she had to "learn to receive". [REDACTED] stated that she stopped trying to regain the ticket, gave [REDACTED] a hug, as he gestured for her to hug him, and she drove home.

[REDACTED] stated that on November 29, 2018, she received a text from [REDACTED] stating that "When you get the job will you be driving in everyday or taking the train". [REDACTED] had mentioned that it (she was getting the job) might happen sooner than later than she had anticipated. [REDACTED] stated that this was the second time that [REDACTED] had guaranteed her the position. The first was multiple times at Maggiano's on November 19, 2018.

[REDACTED] stated that she met [REDACTED] again on January 6, 2019, to review any changes that still had to be made to her newly updated résumé. [REDACTED] stated that they met at Starbucks again, but the door was locked. [REDACTED] stated that something about [REDACTED] body language told her that he was planning on directing their meeting elsewhere. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] pointed out his apartment building and said that they should talk there so they headed in that direction. [REDACTED] stated that while walking there with [REDACTED] she was internally planning escape routes for multiple different scenarios that could have taken place.

This report contains sensitive law enforcement material and is the property of the Office of Inspector General. It may not be copied or reproduced without written permission from the Office of Inspector General. This report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. Its disclosure to unauthorized persons is strictly prohibited and may subject the disclosing party to liability. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. §§ 552, 552a.

Date Printed: 2/26/19
OI Form 09 (11/01)

Office of Inspector General – Investigations
Department of the Treasury

MEMORANDUM OF ACTIVITY

Case Number: USM-19-0017-P	Subject of Activity (Brief Description): [REDACTED]	Date of Activity: February 25, 2019
-------------------------------	--	--

[REDACTED] stated that they sat in the lobby of [REDACTED] building and talked over the résumé. Toward the end of their résumé discussion, the conversation became more casual and [REDACTED] mentioned wanting to invite her boyfriend out for the next meeting they would have. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] changed the conversation about how [REDACTED] band was doing and if she ever get carded at the venues where they play. [REDACTED] stated that she replied by saying that she had been playing these venues for years, before [REDACTED], so the venues mostly know her as a musician and serve her, often without carding. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] told her "I'd like to test that theory."

[REDACTED] stated that while walking to the Milkboy (a bar), [REDACTED] started asking her about how alcohol affects her. [REDACTED] stated that she told [REDACTED] that her tolerance was pretty high and that one beer wouldn't do much, if anything. [REDACTED] then shared with her that he could handle liquor and wine but beer would get to him.

[REDACTED] state that when they reached the Milkboy and ordered a beer, The Golden Globes were on so we were commenting on the ways of different actors and actresses, until I got about halfway through her beer, [REDACTED] asked about how she thought people would be able to tell that she was drunk (e.g. Laughing uncontrollably, talking funny, etc.). [REDACTED] told [REDACTED] that she wasn't aware of any sign, without getting very drunk and that she never felt a difference until quite a few drinks later. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] nodded and sat quietly for a while, watching television.

[REDACTED] stated that she eventually made a comment about someone on TV and drank some beer and, out of left field, [REDACTED] stated to her, "I don't think we could date," or, "We could never date." [REDACTED] stated that she was confused by his comment thinking back to him telling her about how much he loved his wife and three kids in Maryland on the train when we met. [REDACTED] stated that she waited for an explanation from [REDACTED] however, he never responded. [REDACTED] stated that she nervously finished her beer, told [REDACTED] she had to go and he walked her to her car as usual, [REDACTED] hugged her and she drove away.

[REDACTED] stated that she received a call from a woman [REDACTED] [REDACTED] who told her that she had been meeting with [REDACTED] as well and that he had promised her the

This report contains sensitive law enforcement material and is the property of the Office of Inspector General. It may not be copied or reproduced without written permission from the Office of Inspector General. This report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. Its disclosure to unauthorized persons is strictly prohibited and may subject the disclosing party to liability. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. §§ 552, 552a.

Date Printed: 4/4/19
OIG Form-09 (10-01)

Office of Inspector General – Investigations
Department of the Treasury

MEMORANDUM OF ACTIVITY

Case Number: USM-19-0017-P	Subject of Activity (Brief Description): [REDACTED]	Date of Activity: February 25, 2019
-------------------------------	--	--

secretary job with the USM. [REDACTED] stated that their stories sounded similar and that [REDACTED] had told her that she filed a complaint against [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] stated that shortly after [REDACTED] had called her, [REDACTED] contacted her on February 6, 2019, and told her that he had a job for her and he would pass her resume onto a lady at Procurevis. [REDACTED] stated that the job was for four hours a week and paid \$1200-1400 and she would have to take notes during interviews. [REDACTED] stated that originally, [REDACTED] had told her that the position was a government position, but finally told her it was a contractor position. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] called her on February 19, 2019, and asked for her Social Security number and if she had a tax ID number. [REDACTED] stated that she was not comfortable giving [REDACTED] her personal information after speaking with [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] stated that she has not been in contact with [REDACTED] since February 19, 2019. [REDACTED] provide TIG with copies of Attachments 1-2.

Attachments:

- 1) Copies of parking ticket paid by [REDACTED]
- 2) Copies of notes of timeline

This report contains sensitive law enforcement material and is the property of the Office of Inspector General. It may not be copied or reproduced without written permission from the Office of Inspector General. This report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. Its disclosure to unauthorized persons is strictly prohibited and may subject the disclosing party to liability. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. §§ 552, 552a.

Date Printed: 4/4/19
OIG Form 479 (10/01)

Office of Inspector General – Investigations
Department of the Treasury

EXHIBIT 4



MEMORANDUM OF ACTIVITY



Case Number: USM-19-0035-I	Reporting Office: Investigations	Type of Activity: Interview - Other
Date of Activity: March 6, 2019	Date Report Drafted: March 7, 2019	Location of Activity: Telephonic 875 15 th St. NW Washington, DC 2005
Subject of Activity: [REDACTED] Contracting Officer, USM HQ		Activity Conducted By (Name(s) and Title(s)): Investigator [REDACTED]

On March 6, 2019, the Department of the Treasury, Office of Inspector General, Office of Investigations (TIG) telephonically interviewed [REDACTED], Contracting Officer, United States Mint (USM) regarding her knowledge of a contract with the USM and Procurevis.

[REDACTED] stated that she was unaware of any payment for Consulting Services regarding an EEO employee climate survey that [REDACTED] Contract EEO Officer was conducting at the USM Philadelphia. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] is not a bonded contracting officer and cannot obligate funds on behalf of the government as a contractor.

[REDACTED] provided TIG with a copy of the Procurevis contract (Attachment 1).

Attachments:

- 1) Copy of the Procurevis contract dated, October 26, 2016.

This report contains sensitive law enforcement material and is the property of the Office of Inspector General. It may not be copied or reproduced without written permission from the Office of Inspector General. This report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. Its disclosure to unauthorized persons is strictly prohibited and may subject the disclosing party to liability. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. §§ 552, 552a.

Date Printed: 4/4/19
OI Form-09 (10/01)

Office of Inspector General - Investigations
Department of the Treasury

EXHIBIT 5



MEMORANDUM OF ACTIVITY



Case Number: USM-19-0035-I	Reporting Office: Investigations	Type of Activity: Interview - Other
Date of Activity: March 6, 2019	Date Report Drafted: March 7, 2019	Location of Activity: Telephonic 875 15 th St. NW Washington, DC 20005
Subject of Activity: [REDACTED] EEO Manager, USM HQ Diversity Management and Civil Rights Office [REDACTED]		Activity Conducted By (Name(s) and Title(s)): Click here to enter text.

On March 6, 2019, the Department of the Treasury, Office of Inspector General, Office of Investigations (TIG) telephonically interviewed [REDACTED], Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Manager, United States Mint (USM) regarding her knowledge of a contract with the USM and Procurevis.

[REDACTED] stated that she was made aware of a payment for Consulting Services regarding an EEO employee climate survey that [REDACTED] Contract EEO Officer was conducting at the USM Philadelphia. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] is not a contracting officer and cannot obligate funds as a contractor.

[REDACTED] provided TIG with copies of emails regarding this Consulting contract (Attachment 1).

Attachments:

- 1) Copies of emails and invoice for Consulting Services.

This report contains sensitive law enforcement material and is the property of the Office of Inspector General. It may not be copied or reproduced without written permission from the Office of Inspector General. This report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. Its disclosure to unauthorized persons is strictly prohibited and may subject the disclosing party to liability. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. §§ 552, 552a.

Date Printed: 4/4/19
OIG Form 09110011

Office of Inspector General - Investigations
Department of the Treasury

EXHIBIT 6



MEMORANDUM OF ACTIVITY



Case Number: USM-19-0035-I	Reporting Office: Investigations	Type of Activity: Interview - Subject
Date of Activity: March 4, 2019	Date Report Drafted: March 15, 2019	Location of Activity: USM Philadelphia, PA.
Subject of Activity: ██████████ Contractor Senior EEO Specialist USM Philadelphia, PA.		Activity Conducted By (Name(s) and Title(s)): SA ██████████ Investigator ██████████

On March 3, 2019, the Department of the Treasury, Office of Inspector General, Office of Investigations (TIG) interviewed ██████████ Contractor, Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Specialist, United States Mint (USM) Philadelphia, PA, regarding a complaint alleging that he acted as a hiring manager and promised two women jobs at the USM, Philadelphia, and contracted one woman without authorization and obligated U.S. government funds to pay her and sexually harassed both women.

██████████ stated that he is a contractor EEO Specialist at the USM and that prior to his arrival in Philadelphia the office was staffed by three people and now it is only him. ██████████ stated that the USM has had some racial issues in the past and he wanted to conduct an Employee Climate Survey and get a feel of what the employees perceived as the issues within the divisions at the USM Philadelphia. ██████████ stated that he met with ██████████, Deputy Superintendent, USM and ██████████, Senior Advisor, USM and told them of his plan to conduct these surveys, but that he needed an assistant to take notes and assist him with interviews. ██████████ believed that he had both ██████████ and ██████████ permission to move forward with his plan, so he set out to find an assistant.

██████████ stated that the USM had advertised for an assistant position within the EEO office in Philadelphia, however, no one was qualified and the list was cancelled. ██████████ stated that he was talking to two women about the position. One woman named ██████████ whom he met on the train from Washington, DC to Philadelphia. ██████████ stated that the other woman was named ██████████ and that she had provided the USM with ██████████ interpreting for a prospective

This report contains sensitive law enforcement material and is the property of the Office of Inspector General. It may not be copied or reproduced without written permission from the Office of Inspector General. This report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. Its disclosure to unauthorized persons is strictly prohibited and may subject the disclosing party to liability. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. §§ 552, 552a.

MEMORANDUM OF ACTIVITY

Case Number: USM-19-0035-I	Subject of Activity (Brief Description): [REDACTED] Jr.	Date of Activity: March 4, 2019
-------------------------------	--	------------------------------------

employee who was [REDACTED] [REDACTED] stated that he was impressed with how [REDACTED] conducted herself during the interview, so he met with her a few times outside of the USM and reviewed her resume and helped her re-work the resume. [REDACTED] stated that he took both [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] out for lunch or dinner at his expense and helped both women with their resumes and talked to them both about the assistant position. [REDACTED] stated that he felt that [REDACTED] was better qualified for the position because she had relevant interviewing experience and [REDACTED] did not have any experience related to the assistant position at all. [REDACTED] stated that he met with [REDACTED] and talked to her about the assistant position and told her it would be a two day job of approximately three hours a day and would pay \$1000, plus expenses. [REDACTED] stated that he told [REDACTED] that there would be additional sessions at the same rate of pay. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] was interested and that he took her to meet the Plant Manager, [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] provided her services on two separate occasions in January 2019.

[REDACTED] was questioned by TIG regarding his conversations with [REDACTED] relating to his old college professor [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] "arousal process". [REDACTED] was asked to explain this "arousal process" and was asked if he explained the process of arousing women without touching them to Ms. [REDACTED] or Ms. [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] stated that he did talk about [REDACTED] with Ms. [REDACTED] but only in the context that [REDACTED] "told the women in his class that young boys don't know what they are doing with women". [REDACTED] stated that he never talked about the 'arousal process' with either women and that he did discuss the fact that Ms. [REDACTED] told him she was bi-sexual, and since he had never met a bi-sexual person he was curious about it and asked her questions. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] asked him if he had any gay friends and was there any representation of the LGBTQ community within the USM. [REDACTED] stated that he told [REDACTED] that there was not.

[REDACTED] stated that after this meeting, [REDACTED] emailed him and told him that she wanted to keep their relationship professional since they would be working together in the future. [REDACTED] stated that he apologized via email if he offended her and thanked her for her professionalism. [REDACTED] stated that while he was walking her to the subway after their meeting [REDACTED] made a comment about how she was "trying to be a good wife and mother", [REDACTED] stated that he made a comment to her about her statement and that [REDACTED] became visibly upset over what he said and he

This report contains sensitive law enforcement material and is the property of the Office of Inspector General. It may not be copied or reproduced without written permission from the Office of Inspector General. This report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. Its disclosure to unauthorized persons is strictly prohibited and may subject the disclosing party to liability. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. §§ 552, 552a.

MEMORANDUM OF ACTIVITY

Case Number: USM-19-0035-1	Subject of Activity (Brief Description): [REDACTED] Jr.	Date of Activity: March 4, 2019
-------------------------------	--	------------------------------------

believes this is what prompted her to send the email regarding "keeping things professional". [REDACTED] further stated that [REDACTED] had just sat in on an employee session the night before that described what sexual harassment was and that "Quid Pro Quo" is the worst form of harassment.

[REDACTED] stated that he wanted to get [REDACTED] paid for her services so he sent an invoice to [REDACTED], Finance Manager, USM and requested a check for payment since [REDACTED] didn't take credit cards. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] asked him for [REDACTED]'s tax EIN #, so that he USM could report the earnings. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] only had an EIN# for her [REDACTED] and not for her interpreting services or for the assistant position. [REDACTED] stated that he provided an email with the EIN # to [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] provided him with a check. [REDACTED] subsequently sent the check to [REDACTED]'s home address.

[REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] was scheduled to assist him with another session at the USM however, she did not show up and he called her on the telephone and asked what happened? [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] told him that she filed a complaint with EEO in Washington, DC. [REDACTED] had no idea that she had filed a complaint against him until TIG told him during interview.

[REDACTED] was questioned by TIG if he had contacted [REDACTED] to fill the position after [REDACTED] was a no show. [REDACTED] stated that he did call and offer [REDACTED] the position, however, [REDACTED] was reluctant to provide her social security number and did not have a tax EIN#. [REDACTED] stated that his last communication with [REDACTED] was on February 21, 2019.

[REDACTED] was asked by TIG if he is an authorized hiring agent for his company Procurevis or for the USM. [REDACTED] stated that he is not authorized, but he never told the woman that he was, only that there was an open position. [REDACTED] was asked if he was an authorized Contracting officer and authorized to obligate funds on behalf of the USM. [REDACTED] stated that he was not a contracting officer, nor could he obligate funds. [REDACTED] stated that the position and funds were available on the Procurevis contract and he believed that is where the funding came from. [REDACTED] denies ever making any sexual suggestive comments towards either women. [INVESTIGATIVE NOTE: Both women's recollection of their conversations match exactly with what [REDACTED] stated

This report contains sensitive law enforcement material and is the property of the Office of Inspector General. It may not be copied or reproduced without written permission from the Office of Inspector General. This report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. Its disclosure to unauthorized persons is strictly prohibited and may subject the disclosing party to liability. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. §§ 552, 552a.

Date Printed: 4/12/19
OI Form-09 (1/00)

Office of Inspector General – Investigations
Department of the Treasury

MEMORANDUM OF ACTIVITY

Case Number: USM-19-0035-1	Subject of Activity (Brief Description): [REDACTED] Jr.	Date of Activity: March 4, 2019
-------------------------------	--	------------------------------------

they talked about, with the exception of [REDACTED] denial about the "Arousal Process" conversation].

[REDACTED] provided TIG with copies of emails and text messages between himself and [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. (Attachment 1)

Attachments:

- 1) Printed copies of emails and text messages provided by [REDACTED]

This report contains sensitive law enforcement material and is the property of the Office of Inspector General. It may not be copied or reproduced without written permission from the Office of Inspector General. This report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. Its disclosure to unauthorized persons is strictly prohibited and may subject the disclosing party to liability. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. §§ 552, 552a.

EXHIBIT 7



MEMORANDUM OF ACTIVITY



Case Number: USM-19-0035-1	Reporting Office: Investigations	Type of Activity: Interview - Other
Date of Activity: March 5, 2019	Date Report Drafted: March 7, 2019	Location of Activity: USM Philadelphia, PA
Subject of Activity: [REDACTED] Finance Manager, USM Philadelphia [REDACTED]		Activity Conducted By (Name(s) and Title(s)): Investigator [REDACTED] SA [REDACTED]

On March 5, 2019, the Department of the Treasury, Office of Inspector General, Office of Investigations (TIG) interviewed [REDACTED], Finance Manager, United States Mint (USM) Philadelphia, PA, regarding his knowledge of the approval of an invoice for an assistant for [REDACTED] Senior Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) counselor to assist with an employee climate survey in the Numismatics Division.

[REDACTED] stated that he has been with the USM since 1993, and is currently the finance manager. [REDACTED] recalls receiving an email from [REDACTED] along with an invoice for a subcontractor that [REDACTED] had hired to assist him with some employee surveys at the USM. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] told him that he had worked this out with [REDACTED], Deputy Superintendent and [REDACTED], Senior Advisor and that [REDACTED] believed that the subcontractor had been approved by both [REDACTED].

[REDACTED] stated that the subcontractor [REDACTED] did not accept credit cards, so she provided an EIN # to [REDACTED] who then forwarded it to [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] stated that he wrote a check against the USM purchase card account for \$1200 and gave the check to [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] stated that he has no way of checking a company's EIN# and generally it is best to use an independent contractors Social Security number, however, since [REDACTED] provide an EIN # he used this to report her wages. [REDACTED] stated that usually the USM would pay by credit card (Purchase card) under \$5,000, or the USM can write a check for services up to \$5,000. [REDACTED] stated that when a check is written a Tax ID # is needed.

This report contains sensitive law enforcement material and is the property of the Office of Inspector General. It may not be copied or reproduced without written permission from the Office of Inspector General. This report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. Its disclosure to unauthorized persons is strictly prohibited and may subject the disclosing party to liability. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. §§ 552, 552a.

Date Printed: 4/4/19
OIG Form-09 (10/01)

Office of Inspector General - Investigations
Department of the Treasury

MEMORANDUM OF ACTIVITY

Case Number: USM-19-0035-1	Subject of Activity (Brief Description): [REDACTED]	Date of Activity: March 5, 2019
-------------------------------	--	------------------------------------

ATTACHMENT:

1. Copy of email and invoice from [REDACTED] dated, January 28, 2019.

This report contains sensitive law enforcement material and is the property of the Office of Inspector General. It may not be copied or reproduced without written permission from the Office of Inspector General. This report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. Its disclosure to unauthorized persons is strictly prohibited and may subject the disclosing party to liability. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. §§ 552, 552a.

Date Printed: 4/8/19
OI Form 69 (10-01)

Office of Inspector General – Investigations
Department of the Treasury

EXHIBIT 8



MEMORANDUM OF ACTIVITY



Case Number: USM-19-0035-1	Reporting Office: Investigations	Type of Activity: Interview - Other
Date of Activity: March 27, 2019	Date Report Drafted: March 27, 2019	Location of Activity: Telephonic Interview
Subject of Activity: ██████████ Deputy Superintendent, USM Philadelphia 215-872-1683		Activity Conducted By (Name(s) and Title(s)): Investigator ██████████

On March 27, 2019, the Department of the Treasury, Office of Inspector General, Office of Investigations (TIG) telephonically interviewed ██████████ Deputy Superintendent, United States Mint (USM) Philadelphia, PA, regarding his knowledge of the approval to hire an assistant for ██████████ Senior Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) counselor to assist with an employee climate survey in the Numismatics Division.

██████████ stated that he has been a federal employee since 1999, and with the USM since 2005. ██████████ recalls having a meeting with ██████████, Plant Manager and ██████████ regarding areas of concern within the USM regarding EEO issues. ██████████ stated that during the conversation, ██████████ stated that he wanted to conduct an Employee Climate Survey and that his office had an opening for an assistant, and that ██████████ was hoping to fill that position to conduct the surveys. ██████████ stated that he and ██████████ were just listening to ██████████ and assumed that he would work out the hiring issue with his CORE in USM Headquarters (HQ), since the EEO office is a HQ function and doesn't report to the Plant Manager at Philadelphia.

██████████ stated that he later heard that EEO was conducting the surveys and assumed that ██████████ had worked out his staffing issues with HQ. ██████████ stated that he did not give ██████████ any approval to hire anyone or obligate any USM funds to pay for an assistant, nor did ██████████ give her approval. ██████████ stated that he believed the funds for the assistant would come from the existing contract with ██████████ Company and USM HQ. ██████████ stated that he never approved the payment of the assistant from any USM funds.

This report contains sensitive law enforcement material and is the property of the Office of Inspector General. It may not be copied or reproduced without written permission from the Office of Inspector General. This report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. Its disclosure to unauthorized persons is strictly prohibited and may subject the disclosing party to liability. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. §§ 552, 552a.

Date Printed: 4/4/19
OIG Form 09 (10/01)

Office of Inspector General - Investigations
Department of the Treasury

EXHIBIT 9



MEMORANDUM OF ACTIVITY



Case Number: USM-19-0035-I	Reporting Office: Investigations	Type of Activity: Interview - Other
Date of Activity: March 28, 2019	Date Report Drafted: March 28, 2019	Location of Activity: Telephonic Interview
Subject of Activity: [REDACTED] Senior Advisor, USM Philadelphia [REDACTED]		Activity Conducted By (Name(s) and Title(s)): Investigator [REDACTED]

On March 28, 2019, the Department of the Treasury, Office of Inspector General, Office of Investigations (TIG) telephonically interviewed [REDACTED], Senior Advisor, United States Mint (USM) Philadelphia, PA, regarding her knowledge of the approval to hire an assistant for [REDACTED] Senior Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) counselor to assist with an employee climate survey in the Numismatics Division.

[REDACTED] stated that she recalls having a meeting with [REDACTED], Acting Superintendent and [REDACTED] regarding areas of concern within the USM regarding EEO issues. [REDACTED] stated that during the conversation, [REDACTED] stated that he wanted to conduct an Employee Climate Survey and that his office had an opening for an assistant, and that [REDACTED] was hoping to fill that position to conduct the surveys to assist him with note taking. [REDACTED] stated that both she and [REDACTED] were in agreement with [REDACTED] getting assistance, but they both assumed that [REDACTED] would work out the hiring issue with his CORE in USM Headquarters (HQ), since the EEO office is a HQ function and doesn't report to the Plant Manager at Philadelphia.

[REDACTED] stated that she did not give [REDACTED] any approval to hire anyone or obligate any USM funds to pay for an assistant, nor did [REDACTED] give his approval. [REDACTED] stated that she told [REDACTED] to work out the hiring issue with his chain of command and the EEO USM HQ. [REDACTED] stated that she never approved or saw any invoice for the payment of the assistant from any USM funds.

This report contains sensitive law enforcement material and is the property of the Office of Inspector General. It may not be copied or reproduced without written permission from the Office of Inspector General. This report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. Its disclosure to unauthorized persons is strictly prohibited and may subject the disclosing party to liability. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. §§ 552, 552a.

**REPORT OF INVESTIGATION
USM-19-0035-I**



Office of Inspector General

United States Department of the Treasury



Office of the Inspector General U.S. Department of the Treasury



Report of Investigation

Case #: USM-19-0035-I

Case Title: [REDACTED]
Senior EEO Specialist
United States Mint (USM)
Contractor

Case Type: Criminal _____
Administrative X
Civil _____

Investigation Initiated: March 6, 2019

Conducted by: [REDACTED]
Investigator

Investigation Completed: SEP 06 2019

Approved by: [REDACTED]
Special Agent in Charge

Origin: [REDACTED], Chief
United States Mint Police

Summary

On February 25, 2019, the U.S. Department of the Treasury, Office of Inspector General, Office of Investigations (TIG), received a referral from the United States Mint (USM) alleging that USM contract employee [REDACTED] Senior Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Specialist, improperly obligated US funds and, while improperly acting as a hiring official, sexually harassed two civilian females. (Exhibit 1)

The investigation determined that the allegations of misuse of position and improper obligation of government funds were substantiated. While the subject's actions rose quite close to 'quid pro quo' sexual harassment, conditioning potential employment offers upon his victims' willingness to meet with him and subject themselves to sexual innuendo, TIG did not find that the activity, at the point it was reported, rose to that level. However, TIG found that the individual's actions, particularly as they involved his position within the USM, were prejudicial to the government.

TIG referred generally to the Treasury Employee Rules of Conduct. Recognizing that the subject is a contract employee rather than a civil servant, TIG nevertheless considers these standards to establish behavioral expectations that, if not met, establish serious issues regarding the individual's fitness for further duty in the Treasury environment.

Report of Investigation

Case Name: [REDACTED]

Case # USM-19-0035-I

Page 2 of 10

Basis and Scope of the Investigation

On February 25, 2019, the U.S. Department of the Treasury, Office of Inspector General, Office of Investigations (TIG), received a referral from the United States Mint (USM) alleging that USM contract employee [REDACTED] Senior EEO Specialist, improperly obligated U.S. government funds; and, while improperly portraying himself as a hiring official, sexually harassed two civilian females.

During the course of the investigation, interviews were conducted with:

- [REDACTED] Civilian, Witness
- [REDACTED] Civilian, Witness
- [REDACTED] Contractor - Senior EEO Officer, Subject
- [REDACTED] Contracting Officer, USM, Witness
- [REDACTED] EEO Officer, USM, Witness
- [REDACTED] Deputy Superintendent, USM, Witness
- [REDACTED] Senior Advisor, USM, Witness
- [REDACTED] Finance Manager, USM, Witness

In addition, TOIG reviewed pertinent documents, including:

- Copy of Procurevis Task Order with USM, dated October 26, 2016
- Copies of texts and emails between [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]

Investigative Activity

In an interview with TIG, [REDACTED] stated that she met [REDACTED] on November 29, 2018, when she provided [REDACTED] interpretation for a job applicant with the USM. [REDACTED] was a contract employee of [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] asked her for her contact information and told her that he liked how she conducted herself in the interview process and that he had a position opening for a Secretary, assisting him with conducting EEO climate surveys at the USM, which paid about \$1000 for a few hours work. [REDACTED] stated that she had no background in this type of work, however, [REDACTED] stated he was impressed with how she handled herself. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] worked for a company called Procurevis Agency located in Maryland and that [REDACTED] was detailed to Philadelphia for the next 3-5 years. [REDACTED] stated that she met with [REDACTED] on a few occasions for lunch and coffee so that he could help her tweak her résumé for the position he anticipated having in his newly formed EEO office at the USM. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] told her that the Union President had stepped down from the Union and was moving into the EEO position and that since the former president was a "white guy" and she was a female, she would "help balance out the office". [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] told her the secretary position would be a contractor job for the first year and then convert to a

Report of Investigation

Case Name: [REDACTED]

Case # USM-19-0035-I

Page 3 of 10

federal job after that. [REDACTED] stated that she never completed a job application, completed an interview or saw a job description. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] told her that her résumé was her application and that he was the hiring manager. [REDACTED] stated that she completed 1 assessment for the USM EEO Climate Survey over a 2 day period January 8 and January 10, 2019. [REDACTED] stated that she requested [REDACTED] to pay her with a W-9 as an independent contractor, but that he requested a Tax Identification Number for her business. [REDACTED] stated that all she had was an EIN number for her [REDACTED] business and provided [REDACTED] with the following: EIN # [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] stated that she was paid \$1000 plus \$200 for expenses.

[REDACTED] stated that after the assessments she met [REDACTED] for lunch and he began to tell her inappropriate stories about how he learned to please a woman while he was in college and that [REDACTED] wrote his senior thesis on pleasing women and his "Erection process". [REDACTED] stated that she later confronted [REDACTED] on his inappropriate conversation with her and he apologized and stated that it was just a misunderstanding. [REDACTED] then asked [REDACTED] if she was going to continue to do the consulting work and accept the secretary position. [REDACTED] stated that she became suspicious because [REDACTED] told her that there was another woman who wanted the position as well and her name was [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] stated that she became suspicious and contacted [REDACTED] after locating her on Facebook. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] told her that [REDACTED] had offered her the job as well and had been meeting her at restaurants and helping her with her résumé as well. [REDACTED] stated that she felt [REDACTED] was trying to string her along about the position until it was too late to file a harassment complaint against him, so she filed the EEO complaint and has had no contact with [REDACTED] since January 17, 2019. (Exhibit 2)

In an interview with TIG, [REDACTED] stated that on November 18, 2018, she met [REDACTED] on the train home from visiting her boyfriend in Washington, DC. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] was headed back to Philadelphia from his home in Maryland, for work. [REDACTED] stated that they had a very pleasant, friendly conversation, over which she had mentioned that she recently experienced multiple job interviews with very bad companies and was running out of money, rapidly. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] mentioned that he was one of fifteen hiring managers in his company (the Mint) and they were looking to fill an Administrative Assistant position. [REDACTED] asked her to send him her résumé, if she would be interested. [REDACTED] stated that she told [REDACTED] that she was interested, at which point [REDACTED] gave her his government e-mail address and his work and cell number. [REDACTED] reached her destination, shook hands with [REDACTED] and departed. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] asked her to text him that she got home safely. [REDACTED] stated that she did text him when she got home and then sent him her résumé the next morning. [REDACTED] stated that the following day she met [REDACTED] at 8 PM to discuss her résumé and that he had offered to re-write it for her. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] asked her where she would be comfortable meeting. [REDACTED] told [REDACTED] that she would meet him at a Starbucks Coffee location, and asked him to send her the address of the Starbucks that was closest to where he was staying. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] sent her an address but it was not Starbucks. [REDACTED] stated that she later Googled the address that [REDACTED] sent and found that it was AKA Washington Square (834 Chestnut St., Philadelphia

Report of Investigation

Case Name: [REDACTED]

Case # USM-19-0035-I

Page 4 of 10

19107), the apartment building in which [REDACTED] stays during the week for his job. [REDACTED] stated that she did eventually meet [REDACTED] at a Starbucks near his apartment and that the Starbucks was open for at least another hour, but [REDACTED] insisted that they go somewhere else to talk. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] asked her what kind of food she liked, and she mentioned Italian food and they walked to Maggiano's Little Italy on Filbert Street. [REDACTED] stated that they talked about the résumé over a few brief spurts of conversation, but the conversation mostly consisted of his job as a security guard at the Capitol Theatre, working with the band Parliament Funkadelic. [REDACTED] stated that after dinner, [REDACTED] walked her to her car and noticed that she had a \$31.00 parking ticket (Citation [REDACTED]). [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] picked the ticket up, physically withheld it from her and insisted that he would pay for it (just as he demanded to pay for both of their meals at Maggiano's). [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] told her that she had to "learn to receive". [REDACTED] stated that she stopped trying to regain the ticket, gave [REDACTED] a hug, as he gestured for her to hug him, and she drove home.

[REDACTED] stated that on November 29, 2018, she received a text from [REDACTED] stating that "when you get the job will you be driving in everyday or taking the train". [REDACTED] had mentioned that it (she was getting the job) might happen sooner than she had anticipated. [REDACTED] stated that this was the second time that [REDACTED] had guaranteed her the position. The first was multiple times at Maggiano's on November 19, 2018. [REDACTED] stated that she met [REDACTED] again on January 6, 2019, to review any changes that still had to be made to her newly updated résumé. [REDACTED] stated that they met at Starbucks again, but the door was locked. [REDACTED] stated that something about [REDACTED] body language told her that he was planning on directing their meeting elsewhere. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] pointed out his apartment building and said that they should talk there so they headed in that direction. [REDACTED] stated that while walking there with [REDACTED] she was internally planning escape routes for multiple different scenarios that could have taken place.

[REDACTED] stated that they sat in the lobby of [REDACTED] building and talked over the résumé. Toward the end of their résumé discussion, the conversation became more casual and [REDACTED] mentioned wanting to invite her boyfriend out for the next meeting they would have. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] changed the conversation about how [REDACTED] band was doing and if she ever gets carded at the venues where they play. [REDACTED] stated that she replied by saying that she had been playing these venues for years, before turning 21, so the venues mostly know her as a musician and serve her, often without carding. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] told her "I'd like to test that theory." [REDACTED] stated that while walking to the Milkboy (a bar), [REDACTED] started asking her about how alcohol affects her. [REDACTED] stated that she told [REDACTED] that her tolerance was pretty high and that one beer wouldn't do much, if anything. [REDACTED] then shared with her that he could handle liquor and wine but beer would get to him.

[REDACTED] stated that when they reached the Milkboy and ordered a beer, The Golden Globes Award show were on so they were commenting on the ways of different actors and actresses, until she got about halfway through her beer, [REDACTED] asked about how she thought people would be able to tell that she was drunk (e.g. laughing uncontrollably, talking funny, etc.). [REDACTED] told [REDACTED]

Report of Investigation

Case Name: [REDACTED]

Case # USM-19-0035-I

Page 5 of 10

that she wasn't aware of any sign, without getting very drunk and that she never felt a difference until quite a few drinks later. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] nodded and sat quietly for a while, watching television. [REDACTED] stated that she eventually made a comment about someone on TV and drank some beer and, out of left field, [REDACTED] stated to her, "I don't think we could date," or, "We could never date." [REDACTED] stated that she was confused by his comment thinking back to him telling her about how much he loved his wife and three kids in Maryland on the train when we met. [REDACTED] stated that she waited for an explanation from [REDACTED] however, he never responded. [REDACTED] stated that she nervously finished her beer, told [REDACTED] she had to go and he walked her to her car as usual, [REDACTED] hugged her and she drove away.

[REDACTED] stated that she received a call from a woman, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] who told her that she had been meeting with [REDACTED] as well and that he had promised her the secretary job with the USM. [REDACTED] stated that their stories sounded similar and that [REDACTED] had told her that she filed a complaint against [REDACTED] [REDACTED] stated that shortly after [REDACTED] had called her, [REDACTED] contacted her on February 6, 2019, and told her that he had a job for her and he would pass her résumé onto a lady at Procurevis. [REDACTED] stated that the job was for four hours a week and paid \$1200-1400 and she would have to take notes during interviews. [REDACTED] stated that originally, [REDACTED] had told her that the position was a government position, but finally told her it was a contractor position. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] called her on February 19, 2019, and asked for her Social Security number and if she had a tax ID number. [REDACTED] stated that she was not comfortable giving [REDACTED] her personal information after speaking with [REDACTED] [REDACTED] stated that she has not been in contact with [REDACTED] since February 19, 2019. (Exhibit 3)

In an interview with TIG, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Contracting Officer, USM stated that she was unaware of any payment for Consulting Services regarding an EEO employee climate survey that [REDACTED] was conducting at the USM Philadelphia. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] is not a bonded contracting officer and cannot obligate funds on behalf of the government as a contractor. (Exhibit 4)

In an interview with TIG, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] EEO Officer, USM stated that she was made aware of a payment for Consulting Services regarding an EEO employee climate survey that [REDACTED] was conducting at the USM Philadelphia. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] is not a contracting officer and cannot obligate funds as a contractor. (Exhibit 5)

In an interview with TIG, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Contractor - Senior EEO Officer, USM stated that prior to his arrival in Philadelphia, the office was staffed by three people and now it is only him. [REDACTED] stated that the USM has had some racial issues in the past and he wanted to conduct an Employee Climate Survey and get a feel of what the employees perceived as the issues within the divisions at the USM Philadelphia. [REDACTED] stated that he met with [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Deputy Superintendent, USM and [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Senior Advisor, USM and told them of his plan to conduct these surveys, but that he needed an assistant to take notes and assist him with interviews. [REDACTED] believed that he had both [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] permission to move forward with his plan, so he set out to find an assistant.

Report of Investigation

Case Name: [REDACTED]

Case # USM-19-0035-I

Page 6 of 10

[REDACTED] stated that the USM had advertised for an assistant position within the EEO office in Philadelphia, however, no one was qualified and the list was cancelled. [REDACTED] stated that he was talking to two women about the position. One woman named [REDACTED] whom he met on the train from Washington, DC to Philadelphia. [REDACTED] stated that the other woman was named [REDACTED] and that she had provided the USM with Sign Language interpreting for a prospective employee who was deaf. [REDACTED] stated that he was impressed with how [REDACTED] conducted herself during the interview, so he met with her a few times outside of the USM and reviewed her résumé and helped her re-work the résumé. [REDACTED] stated that he took both [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] out for lunch or dinner at his expense and helped both women with their résumés and talked to them both about the assistant position. [REDACTED] stated that he felt that [REDACTED] was better qualified for the position because she had relevant interviewing experience and [REDACTED] did not have any experience related to the assistant position at all. [REDACTED] stated that he met with [REDACTED] and talked to her about the assistant position and told her it would be a two day job of approximately three hours a day and would pay \$1000, plus expenses. [REDACTED] stated that he told [REDACTED] that there would be additional sessions at the same rate of pay. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] was interested and that he took her to meet the Plant Manager, [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] provided her services on two separate occasions in January 2019.

[REDACTED] was questioned by TIG regarding his conversations with [REDACTED] relating to his old college professor, Mr. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] "arousal process". [REDACTED] was asked to explain this "arousal process" and was asked if he explained the process of arousing women without touching them to Ms. [REDACTED] or Ms. [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] stated that he did talk about Professor [REDACTED] with Ms. [REDACTED] but only in the context that Professor [REDACTED] "told the women in his class that young boys don't know what they are doing with women". [REDACTED] stated that he never talked about the "arousal process" with either women and that he did discuss the fact that Ms. [REDACTED] told him she was bi-sexual, and since he had never met a bi-sexual person he was curious about it and asked her questions. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] asked him if he had any gay friends and was there any representation of the LGBTQ community within the USM. [REDACTED] stated that he told [REDACTED] that there was not.

[REDACTED] stated that after this meeting, [REDACTED] emailed him and told him that she wanted to keep their relationship professional since they would be working together in the future. [REDACTED] stated that he apologized via email if he offended her and thanked her for her professionalism. [REDACTED] stated that while he was walking her to the subway after their meeting [REDACTED] made a comment about how she was "trying to be a good wife and mother", [REDACTED] stated that he made a comment to her about her statement and that [REDACTED] became visibly upset over what he said and he believes this is what prompted her to send the email regarding "keeping things professional". [REDACTED] further stated that [REDACTED] had just sat in on an employee session the night before that described what sexual harassment was and that "Quid Pro Quo" is the worst form of harassment.

[REDACTED] stated that he wanted to get [REDACTED] paid for her services so he sent an invoice to [REDACTED] Finance Manager, USM and requested a check for payment since [REDACTED] didn't take credit

Report of Investigation

Case Name: [REDACTED]

Case # USM-19-0035-I

Page 7 of 10

cards. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] asked him for [REDACTED] tax EIN, so that the USM could report the earnings. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] only had an EIN for her [REDACTED] business and not for her interpreting services or for the assistant position. [REDACTED] stated that he provided an email with the EIN to [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] provided him with a check. [REDACTED] subsequently sent the check to [REDACTED] home address.

[REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] was scheduled to assist him with another session at the USM however, she did not show up and he called her on the telephone and asked what happened. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] told him that she filed a complaint with the USM Equal Employment Opportunity Office in Washington, DC. [REDACTED] had no idea that she had filed a complaint against him until TIG told him during the interview.

[REDACTED] was questioned by TIG if he had contacted [REDACTED] to fill the position after [REDACTED] was a no show. [REDACTED] stated that he did call and offered [REDACTED] the position, however, [REDACTED] was reluctant to provide her social security number and did not have a tax EIN. [REDACTED] stated that his last communication with [REDACTED] was on February 21, 2019.

[REDACTED] was asked by TIG if he is an authorized hiring agent for his company, Procurevis, or for the USM. [REDACTED] stated that he is not authorized, but he never told the woman that he was, only that there was an open position. [REDACTED] was asked if he was an authorized Contracting Officer and authorized to obligate funds on behalf of the USM. [REDACTED] stated that he was not a contracting officer, nor could he obligate funds. [REDACTED] stated that the position and funds were available on the Procurevis contract and he believed that is where the funding came from. [REDACTED] denies ever making any sexually suggestive comments towards either women.

[INVESTIGATIVE NOTE: Both women's recollection of their conversations match exactly with what [REDACTED] stated they talked about, with the exception of [REDACTED] denial about the "Arousal Process" conversation]. (Exhibit 6).

In an interview with TIG, [REDACTED] Finance Manager, USM stated that he recalls receiving an email from [REDACTED] along with an invoice for a subcontractor that [REDACTED] had hired to assist him with some employee surveys at the USM. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] told him that he had worked this out with [REDACTED] Deputy Superintendent and [REDACTED] Senior Advisor and that [REDACTED] believed that the subcontractor had been approved by both [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] stated that the subcontractor [REDACTED] did not accept credit cards, so she provided an EIN to [REDACTED] who then forwarded it to [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] stated that he wrote a check against the USM purchase card account for \$1200 and gave the check to [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] stated that he has no way of checking a company's EIN and generally it is best to use an independent contractors Social Security number, however, since [REDACTED] provide an EIN # he used this to report her wages. [REDACTED] stated that usually the USM would pay by credit card (Purchase card) under \$5,000, or the USM can write a check for services up to \$5,000. [REDACTED] stated that when a check is written a Tax ID Number is needed. (Exhibit 7)

Report of Investigation

Case Name: [REDACTED]

Case # USM-19-0035-I

Page 8 of 10

In an interview with TIG, [REDACTED] Deputy Superintendent, USM, stated that he recalls having a meeting with [REDACTED] Senior Advisor, and [REDACTED] regarding areas of concern within the USM regarding EEO issues. [REDACTED] stated that during the conversation, [REDACTED] stated that he wanted to conduct an Employee Climate Survey and that his office had an opening for an assistant, and that [REDACTED] was hoping to fill that position to conduct the surveys. [REDACTED] stated that he and [REDACTED] were just listening to [REDACTED] and assumed that he would work out the hiring issue with his COR in USM Headquarters (HQ), since the EEO office is a HQ function and doesn't report to the Plant Manager at Philadelphia. [REDACTED] stated that he later heard that EEO was conducting the surveys and assumed that [REDACTED] had worked out his staffing issues with HQ. [REDACTED] stated that he did not give [REDACTED] any approval to hire anyone or obligate any USM funds to pay for an assistant, nor did [REDACTED] give her approval. [REDACTED] stated that he believed the funds for the assistant would come from the existing contract with [REDACTED] company and USM HQ. [REDACTED] stated that he never approved the payment of the assistant from any USM funds. (Exhibit 8)

In an interview with TIG, [REDACTED] Senior Advisor, USM, stated that she recalls having a meeting with [REDACTED] Acting Superintendent and [REDACTED] regarding areas of concern within the USM regarding EEO issues. [REDACTED] stated that during the conversation, [REDACTED] stated that he wanted to conduct an Employee Climate Survey and that his office had an opening for an assistant, and that [REDACTED] was hoping to fill that position to conduct the surveys to assist him with note taking. [REDACTED] stated that both she and [REDACTED] were in agreement with [REDACTED] getting assistance, but they both assumed that [REDACTED] would work out the hiring issue with his COR in USM Headquarters (HQ), since the EEO office is a HQ function and doesn't report to the Plant Manager at Philadelphia. [REDACTED] stated that she did not give [REDACTED] any approval to hire anyone or obligate any USM funds to pay for an assistant, nor did [REDACTED] give his approval. [REDACTED] stated that she told [REDACTED] to work out the hiring issue with his chain of command and the EEO USM HQ. [REDACTED] stated that she never approved or saw any invoice for the payment of the assistant from any USM funds. (Exhibit 9)

Referrals

N/A

Judicial Action

N/A

Findings

The investigation determined that the allegations of misuse of position and obligating government funds as well as making inappropriate comments with one civilian female [REDACTED] was

This Report of Investigation is the property of the Office of Investigation, Treasury Office of the Inspector General. It contains sensitive law enforcement information and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission in accordance with 5 U.S.C. § 552. This report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited.

Report of Investigation

Case Name: [REDACTED]

Case # USM-19-0035-I

Page 9 of 10

substantiated. TIG interviewed both female victims and USM management in Philadelphia as well as USM EEO officials and contracting officer.

Based on the findings of our investigation, it appears that the following pertinent statute(s), regulation(s) and/or policy (ies) were violated or could be applied to the case:

- § 0.201 Acting within scope of authority. An employee shall not engage in any conduct or activity that is in excess of his or her authority or is otherwise contrary to any law, regulation, or Department policy.
- § 0.217 Nondiscrimination.(a) Employees shall not discriminate against or harass any other employee, applicant for employment, contractor, or person dealing with the Department on official business on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, sex, sexual orientation, age, disability, political affiliation, marital status, parental status, veterans status, or genetic information.
- §31 CFR 0.218 General conduct prejudicial to the government. An employee shall not engage in criminal, infamous, dishonest, immoral, or notoriously disgraceful conduct, or other conduct prejudicial to the government.
- USM Procurement Guidelines, Section D., Contracting Officer Authority

Distribution

Dennis O'Connor, Chief, United States Mint Police

Signatures

Case Agent:

[REDACTED]

9/3/19
Date

9/5/19
Date

This Report of Investigation is the property of the Office of Investigation, Treasury Office of the Inspector General. It contains sensitive law enforcement information and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission in accordance with 5 U.S.C. § 552. This report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited.

Report of Investigation

Case Name: [REDACTED]

Case # USM-19-0035-I

Page 10 of 10

Exhibits

1. Complaint letter from Dennis O'Connor, Chief USM Police, dated February 22, 2019.
2. Memorandum of Activity, Interview of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] dated February 28, 2019.
3. Memorandum of Activity, Interview of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] dated February 28, 2019.
4. Memorandum of Activity, Interview of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] dated March 7, 2019.
5. Memorandum of Activity, Interview of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] dated March 7, 2019.
6. Memorandum of Activity, Interview of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] dated March 15, 2019.
7. Memorandum of Activity, Interview of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] dated March 7, 2019.
8. Memorandum of Activity, Interview of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] dated March 27, 2019.
9. Memorandum of Activity, Interview of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] dated March 28, 2019.

**REPORT OF INVESTIGATION
USM-19-0035-I**



Office of Inspector General

United States Department of the Treasury



Office of the Inspector General U.S. Department of the Treasury



Report of Investigation

Case #: USM-19-0035-I

Case Title:

██████████
Senior EEO Specialist
United States Mint (USM)
Contractor

Case Type:

Criminal _____
Administrative X
Civil _____

Investigation Initiated: March 6, 2019

Conducted by:

██████████
Investigator

Investigation Completed:

APR 19 2019

Approved by:

██████████
Special Agent in Charge

Origin: ██████████, Chief
United States Mint Police

Summary

On February 25, 2019, the Department of the Treasury, Office of Inspector General, Office of Investigations (TIG), received a referral from the United States Mint (USM) alleging that USM contract employee ██████████ Senior EEO Specialist, misused his position and acted as a hiring manager and obligated US government funds as well as sexually harassed two civilian females. (Exhibit 1)

The investigation determined that the allegations of misuse of position and obligating government funds as well as making inappropriate comments with one civilian female was substantiated. TIG interviewed both female victims and USM management in Philadelphia as well as USM EEO officials and contracting officer. No one within the USM organization authorized ██████████ to hire an assistant or obligate US government funds (\$1200) to pay for the services the assistant provided.

Report of Investigation

Case Name: [REDACTED]

Case # USM-19-0035-I

Page 2 of 10

Basis and Scope of the Investigation

On February 25, 2019, the Department of the Treasury, Office of Inspector General, Office of Investigations (TIG), received a referral from the United States Mint (USM) alleging that USM contract employee [REDACTED] Senior EEO Specialist, misused his position and acted as a hiring manager and obligated US government funds as well as sexually harassed two civilian females.

During the course of the investigation, interviews were conducted with:

- [REDACTED] Civilian, Witness
- [REDACTED] Civilian, Witness
- [REDACTED] Contractor - Senior EEO Officer, Subject
- [REDACTED] Contracting Officer, USM, Witness
- [REDACTED] EEO Officer, USM, Witness
- [REDACTED] Deputy Superintendent, USM, Witness
- [REDACTED] Senior Advisor, USM, Witness
- [REDACTED] Finance Manager, USM, Witness

In addition, TOIG reviewed pertinent documents, including:

- Copy of Procurevis contract with USM, dated October 26, 2016
- Copies of texts and emails between [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]

Investigative Activity

In an interview with TIG, [REDACTED] Civilian, stated that she met [REDACTED] on November 29, 2018, when she provided American Sign Language (ASL) interpretation for a job applicant with the USM. [REDACTED] was a contract employee of Sign for You Agency. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] asked her for her contact information and told her that he liked how she conducted herself in the interview process and that he had a position opening for a Secretary, assisting him with conducting EEO climate surveys at the USM and paid about \$1000 for a few hours work. [REDACTED] stated that she had no background in this type of work, however, [REDACTED] was impressed with how she handled herself. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] worked for a Company called Procurevis Agency located in Maryland and that [REDACTED] was detailed to Philadelphia for the next 3-5 years. [REDACTED] stated that she met with [REDACTED] on a few occasions for lunch and coffee so that he could help her tweak her résumé for the position he anticipated having in his newly formed EEO office at the USM. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] told her that the Union President had stepped down from the Union and was moving into the EEO position and that since the former president was a "white guy" and she was a female, she would "help balance out the office". [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] told her the secretary position would be a contractor job for the first

This Report of Investigation is the property of the Office of Investigation, Treasury Office of the Inspector General. It contains sensitive law enforcement information and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission in accordance with 5 U.S.C. § 552. This report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited.

Report of Investigation

Case Name: [REDACTED]

Case # USM-19-0035-I

Page 3 of 10

year and then convert to a federal job after that. [REDACTED] stated that she never completed a job application, completed an interview or saw a job description. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] told her that her résumé was her application and that he was the hiring manager. [REDACTED] stated that she completed 1 assessment for the USM EEO Climate Survey over a 2 day period January 8 and January 10, 2019. [REDACTED] stated that she requested [REDACTED] to pay her with a W-9 as an independent contractor, but that he requested a Tax Identification Number for her business. [REDACTED] stated that all she had was an EIN number for her [REDACTED] repair business and provided [REDACTED] with the following: EIN # [REDACTED] - [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] stated that she was paid \$1000 plus \$200 for expenses.

[REDACTED] stated that after the assessments she met [REDACTED] for lunch and he began to tell her inappropriate stories about how he learned to please a woman while he was in college and that he wrote his senior thesis on pleasing women and his "Erection process". [REDACTED] stated that she later confronted [REDACTED] on his inappropriate conversation with her and he apologized and stated that it was just a misunderstanding. [REDACTED] then asked [REDACTED] if she was going to continue to do the consulting work and accept the secretary position. [REDACTED] stated that she became suspicious because [REDACTED] told her that there was another woman who wanted the position as well and her name was [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] stated that she became suspicious and contacted [REDACTED] after locating her on Facebook. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] told her that [REDACTED] had offered her the job as well and had been meeting her at restaurants and helping her with her résumé as well. [REDACTED] stated that she felt [REDACTED] was trying to string her along about the position until it was too late to file a harassment complaint against him, so she filed the EEO complaint and has had no contact with [REDACTED] since January 17, 2019. (Exhibit 2)

In an interview with TIG, [REDACTED] Civilian, stated that on November 18, 2018, she met [REDACTED] on the train home from visiting her boyfriend in Washington, DC. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] was headed back to Philadelphia from his home in Maryland, for work. [REDACTED] stated that they had a very pleasant, friendly conversation, over which she had mentioned that she recently experienced multiple job interviews with very bad companies and was running out of money, rapidly. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] mentioned that he was one of fifteen hiring managers in his company (the Mint) and they were looking to fill an Administrative Assistant position. [REDACTED] asked her to send him her résumé, if she would be interested. [REDACTED] stated that she told [REDACTED] that she was interested, at which point [REDACTED] gave her his government e-mail address and his work and cell number. [REDACTED] reached her destination, shook hands with [REDACTED] and departed. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] asked her to text him that she got home safely. [REDACTED] stated that she did text him when she got home and then sent him her résumé the next morning. [REDACTED] stated that the following day she met [REDACTED] at 8 PM to discuss her résumé and that he had offered to re-write it for her. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] asked her where she would be comfortable meeting. [REDACTED] told [REDACTED] that she would meet him at a Starbucks Coffee location, and asked him to send her the address of the Starbucks that was closest to where he was staying. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] sent her an address but it was not Starbucks. [REDACTED] stated that she later Googled the address that [REDACTED] sent and found that it was AKA

Washington Square (834 Chestnut St., Philadelphia 19107), the apartment building in which [REDACTED] stays during the week for his job. [REDACTED] stated that she did eventually meet [REDACTED] at a Starbucks near his apartment and that the Starbucks was open for at least another hour, but [REDACTED] insisted that they go somewhere else to talk. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] asked her what kind of food she liked, and she mentioned Italian food and they walked to Maggiano's Little Italy on Filbert Street. [REDACTED] stated that they talked about the résumé over a few brief spurts of conversation, but the conversation mostly consisted of his job as a security guard at the Capitol Theatre, working with the band Parliament Funkadelic. [REDACTED] stated that after dinner, [REDACTED] walked her to her car and noticed that she had a \$31.00 parking ticket (Citation #772150223). [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] picked the ticket up, physically withheld it from her and insisted that he would pay for it (just as he demanded to pay for both of their meals at Maggiano's). [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] told her that she had to "learn to receive". [REDACTED] stated that she stopped trying to regain the ticket, gave [REDACTED] a hug, as he gestured for her to hug him, and she drove home.

[REDACTED] stated that on November 29, 2018, she received a text from [REDACTED] stating that "When you get the job will you be driving in everyday or taking the train". [REDACTED] had mentioned that it (she was getting the job) might happen sooner than later than she had anticipated. [REDACTED] stated that this was the second time that [REDACTED] had guaranteed her the position. The first was multiple times at Maggiano's on November 19, 2018. [REDACTED] stated that she met [REDACTED] again on January 6, 2019, to review any changes that still had to be made to her newly updated résumé. [REDACTED] stated that they met at Starbucks again, but the door was locked. [REDACTED] stated that something about [REDACTED] body language told her that he was planning on directing their meeting elsewhere. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] pointed out his apartment building and said that they should talk there so they headed in that direction. [REDACTED] stated that while walking there with [REDACTED] she was internally planning escape routes for multiple different scenarios that could have taken place.

[REDACTED] stated that they sat in the lobby of [REDACTED] building and talked over the résumé. Toward the end of their résumé discussion, the conversation became more casual and [REDACTED] mentioned wanting to invite her boyfriend out for the next meeting they would have. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] changed the conversation about how [REDACTED] band was doing and if she ever get carded at the venues where they play. [REDACTED] stated that she replied by saying that she had been playing these venues for years, before turning 21, so the venues mostly know her as a musician and serve her, often without carding. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] told her "I'd like to test that theory." [REDACTED] stated that while walking to the Milkboy (a bar), [REDACTED] started asking her about how alcohol affects her. [REDACTED] stated that she told [REDACTED] that her tolerance was pretty high and that one beer wouldn't do much, if anything. [REDACTED] then shared with her that he could handle liquor and wine but beer would get to him.

[REDACTED] stated that when they reached the Milkboy and ordered a beer, The Golden Globes were on so they were commenting on the ways of different actors and actresses, until she got

Report of Investigation

Case Name: [REDACTED]

Case # USM-19-0035-I

Page 5 of 10

about halfway through her beer, [REDACTED] asked about how she thought people would be able to tell that she was drunk (e.g. Laughing uncontrollably, talking funny, etc.). [REDACTED] told [REDACTED] that she wasn't aware of any sign, without getting very drunk and that she never felt a difference until quite a few drinks later. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] nodded and sat quietly for a while, watching television. [REDACTED] stated that she eventually made a comment about someone on TV and drank some beer and, out of left field, [REDACTED] stated to her, "I don't think we could date," or, "We could never date." [REDACTED] stated that she was confused by his comment thinking back to him telling her about how much he loved his wife and three kids in Maryland on the train when we met. [REDACTED] stated that she waited for an explanation from [REDACTED] however, he never responded. [REDACTED] stated that she nervously finished her beer, told [REDACTED] she had to go and he walked her to her car as usual, [REDACTED] hugged her and she drove away.

[REDACTED] stated that she received a call from a woman, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] who told her that she had been meeting with [REDACTED] as well and that he had promised her the secretary job with the USM. [REDACTED] stated that their stories sounded similar and that [REDACTED] had told her that she filed a complaint against [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] stated that shortly after [REDACTED] had called her, [REDACTED] contacted her on February 6, 2019, and told her that he had a job for her and he would pass her résumé onto a lady at Procurevis. [REDACTED] stated that the job was for four hours a week and paid \$1200-1400 and she would have to take notes during interviews. [REDACTED] stated that originally, [REDACTED] had told her that the position was a government position, but finally told her it was a contractor position. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] called her on February 19, 2019, and asked for her Social Security number and if she had a tax ID number. [REDACTED] stated that she was not comfortable giving [REDACTED] her personal information after speaking with [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] stated that she has not been in contact with [REDACTED] since February 19, 2019. (Exhibit 3)

In an interview with TIG, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Contracting Officer, USM stated that she was unaware of any payment for Consulting Services regarding an EEO employee climate survey that [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Contract EEO Officer was conducting at the USM Philadelphia. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] is not a bonded contracting officer and cannot obligate funds on behalf of the government as a contractor. (Exhibit 4)

In an interview with TIG, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] EEO Officer, USM stated that she was made aware of a payment for Consulting Services regarding an EEO employee climate survey that [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Contract EEO Officer was conducting at the USM Philadelphia. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] is not a contracting officer and cannot obligate funds as a contractor. (Exhibit 5)

In an interview with TIG, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Contractor - Senior EEO Officer, USM stated that prior to his arrival in Philadelphia the office was staffed by three people and now it is only him. [REDACTED] stated that the USM has had some racial issues in the past and he wanted to conduct an Employee Climate Survey and get a feel of what the employees perceived as the issues within the divisions at the USM Philadelphia. [REDACTED] stated that he met with [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Deputy

This Report of Investigation is the property of the Office of Investigation, Treasury Office of the Inspector General. It contains sensitive law enforcement information and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission in accordance with 5 U.S.C. § 552. This report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited.

Report of Investigation

Case Name: [REDACTED]

Case # USM-19-0035-I

Page 6 of 10

Superintendent, USM and [REDACTED] Senior Advisor, USM and told them of his plan to conduct these surveys, but that he needed an assistant to take notes and assist him with interviews. [REDACTED] believed that he had both [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] permission to move forward with his plan, so he set out to find an assistant.

[REDACTED] stated that the USM had advertised for an assistant position within the EEO office in Philadelphia, however, no one was qualified and the list was cancelled. [REDACTED] stated that he was talking to two women about the position. One woman named [REDACTED] whom he met on the train from Washington, DC to Philadelphia. [REDACTED] stated that the other woman was named [REDACTED] and that she had provided the USM with Sign Language interpreting for a prospective employee who was deaf. [REDACTED] stated that he was impressed with how [REDACTED] conducted herself during the interview, so he met with her a few times outside of the USM and reviewed her résumé and helped her re-work the résumé. [REDACTED] stated that he took both [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] out for lunch or dinner at his expense and helped both women with their résumés and talked to them both about the assistant position. [REDACTED] stated that he felt that [REDACTED] was better qualified for the position because she had relevant interviewing experience and [REDACTED] did not have any experience related to the assistant position at all. [REDACTED] stated that he met with [REDACTED] and talked to her about the assistant position and told her it would be a two day job of approximately three hours a day and would pay \$1000, plus expenses. [REDACTED] stated that he told [REDACTED] that there would be additional sessions at the same rate of pay. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] was interested and that he took her to meet the Plant Manager, [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] provided her services on two separate occasions in January 2019.

[REDACTED] was questioned by TIG regarding his conversations with [REDACTED] relating to his old college professor [REDACTED] "arousal process". [REDACTED] was asked to explain this "arousal process" and was asked if he explained the process of arousing women without touching them to Ms. [REDACTED] or Ms. [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] stated that he did talk about Professor [REDACTED] with Ms. [REDACTED] but only in the context that [REDACTED] "told the women in his class that young boys don't know what they are doing with women". [REDACTED] stated that he never talked about the "arousal process" with either women and that he did discuss the fact that Ms. [REDACTED] told him she was bi-sexual, and since he had never met a bi-sexual person he was curious about it and asked her questions. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] asked him if he had any gay friends and was there any representation of the LGBTQ community within the USM. [REDACTED] stated that he told [REDACTED] that there was not.

[REDACTED] stated that after this meeting, [REDACTED] emailed him and told him that she wanted to keep their relationship professional since they would be working together in the future. [REDACTED] stated that he apologized via email if he offended her and thanked her for her professionalism. [REDACTED] stated that while he was walking her to the subway after their meeting [REDACTED] made a comment about how she was "trying to be a good wife and mother", [REDACTED] stated that he made a comment to her about her statement and that [REDACTED] became visibly upset over what

Report of Investigation

Case Name: [REDACTED]

Case # USM-19-0035-I

Page 7 of 10

he said and he believes this is what prompted her to send the email regarding "keeping things professional". [REDACTED] further stated that [REDACTED] had just sat in on an employee session the night before that described what sexual harassment was and that "Quid Pro Quo" is the worst form of harassment.

[REDACTED] stated that he wanted to get [REDACTED] paid for her services so he sent an invoice to [REDACTED] Finance Manager, USM and requested a check for payment since [REDACTED] didn't take credit cards. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] asked him for [REDACTED] tax EIN, so that the USM could report the earnings. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] only had an EIN for her husband's [REDACTED] business and not for her interpreting services or for the assistant position. [REDACTED] stated that he provided an email with the EIN to [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] provided him with a check. [REDACTED] subsequently sent the check to [REDACTED] home address.

[REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] was scheduled to assist him with another session at the USM however, she did not show up and he called her on the telephone and asked what happened? [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] told him that she filed a complaint with EEO in Washington, DC. [REDACTED] had no idea that she had filed a complaint against him until TIG told him during the interview.

[REDACTED] was questioned by TIG if he had contacted [REDACTED] to fill the position after [REDACTED] was a no show. [REDACTED] stated that he did call and offer [REDACTED] the position, however, [REDACTED] was reluctant to provide her social security number and did not have a tax EIN. [REDACTED] stated that his last communication with [REDACTED] was on February 21, 2019.

[REDACTED] was asked by TIG if he is an authorized hiring agent for his company, Procurevis, or for the USM. [REDACTED] stated that he is not authorized, but he never told the woman that he was, only that there was an open position. [REDACTED] was asked if he was an authorized Contracting Officer and authorized to obligate funds on behalf of the USM. [REDACTED] stated that he was not a contracting officer, nor could he obligate funds. [REDACTED] stated that the position and funds were available on the Procurevis contract and he believed that is where the funding came from. [REDACTED] denies ever making any sexually suggestive comments towards either women. [INVESTIGATIVE NOTE: Both women's recollection of their conversations match exactly with what [REDACTED] stated they talked about, with the exception of [REDACTED] denial about the "Arousal Process" conversation]. (Exhibit 6)

In an interview with TIG, [REDACTED] Finance Manager, USM stated that he recalls receiving an email from [REDACTED] along with an invoice for a subcontractor that [REDACTED] had hired to assist him with some employee surveys at the USM. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] told him that he had worked this out with [REDACTED] Deputy Superintendent and [REDACTED] Senior Advisor and that [REDACTED] believed that the subcontractor had been approved by both [REDACTED] and Johnson. [REDACTED] stated that the subcontractor [REDACTED] did not accept credit cards, so she provided an EIN to [REDACTED] who then forwarded it to [REDACTED] [REDACTED] stated that he wrote a

Report of Investigation

Case Name: [REDACTED]

Case # USM-19-0035-I

Page 8 of 10

check against the USM purchase card account for \$1200 and gave the check to [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] stated that he has no way of checking a company's EIN and generally it is best to use an independent contractors Social Security number, however, since [REDACTED] provide an EIN # he used this to report her wages. [REDACTED] stated that usually the USM would pay by credit card (Purchase card) under \$5,000, or the USM can write a check for services up to \$5,000. [REDACTED] stated that when a check is written a Tax ID Number is needed. (Exhibit 7)

In an interview with TIG, [REDACTED] Deputy Superintendent, USM, stated that he recalls having a meeting with [REDACTED] Senior Advisor and [REDACTED] regarding areas of concern within the USM regarding EEO issues. [REDACTED] stated that during the conversation, [REDACTED] stated that he wanted to conduct an Employee Climate Survey and that his office had an opening for an assistant, and that [REDACTED] was hoping to fill that position to conduct the surveys. [REDACTED] stated that he and [REDACTED] were just listening to [REDACTED] and assumed that he would work out the hiring issue with his CORE in USM Headquarters (HQ), since the EEO office is a HQ function and doesn't report to the Plant Manager at Philadelphia. [REDACTED] stated that he later heard that EEO was conducting the surveys and assumed that [REDACTED] had worked out his staffing issues with HQ. [REDACTED] stated that he did not give [REDACTED] any approval to hire anyone or obligate any USM funds to pay for an assistant, nor did [REDACTED] give her approval. [REDACTED] stated that he believed the funds for the assistant would come from the existing contract with [REDACTED] Company and USM HQ. [REDACTED] stated that he never approved the payment of the assistant from any USM funds. (Exhibit 8)

In an interview with TIG, [REDACTED] Senior Advisor, USM, stated that she recalls having a meeting with [REDACTED] Acting Superintendent and [REDACTED] regarding areas of concern within the USM regarding EEO issues. [REDACTED] stated that during the conversation, [REDACTED] stated that he wanted to conduct an Employee Climate Survey and that his office had an opening for an assistant, and that [REDACTED] was hoping to fill that position to conduct the surveys to assist him with note taking. [REDACTED] stated that both she and [REDACTED] were in agreement with [REDACTED] getting assistance, but they both assumed that [REDACTED] would work out the hiring issue with his CORE in USM Headquarters (HQ), since the EEO office is a HQ function and doesn't report to the Plant Manager at Philadelphia. [REDACTED] stated that she did not give [REDACTED] any approval to hire anyone or obligate any USM funds to pay for an assistant, nor did [REDACTED] give his approval. [REDACTED] stated that she told [REDACTED] to work out the hiring issue with his chain of command and the EEO USM HQ. [REDACTED] stated that she never approved or saw any invoice for the payment of the assistant from any USM funds. (Exhibit 9)

Referrals

N/A

Judicial Action

N/A

This Report of Investigation is the property of the Office of Investigation, Treasury Office of the Inspector General. It contains sensitive law enforcement information and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission in accordance with 5 U.S.C. § 552. This report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited.

Report of Investigation

Case Name: [REDACTED]

Case # USM-19-0035-I

Page 9 of 10

Findings

The investigation determined that the allegations of misuse of position and obligating government funds as well as making inappropriate comments with one civilian female was substantiated. TIG interviewed both female victims and USM management in Philadelphia as well as USM EEO officials and contracting officer. No one within the USM organization authorized [REDACTED] to hire an assistant or obligate US government funds (\$1200) to pay for the services the assistant provided.

Based on the findings of our investigation, it appears that the following pertinent statute(s), regulation(s) and/or policy (ies) were violated or could be applied to the case:

CFR 31 § 0.213 - General conduct prejudicial to the Government

31 U.S.C. § 41(a)(1)(A) - The Antideficiency Act prohibits federal employees from making or authorizing an expenditure from, or creating or authorizing an obligation under, any appropriation or fund in excess of the amount available in the appropriation or fund unless authorized by law.

Distribution

Dennis O'Connor, Chief, United States Mint Police

Signatures

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

4-17-19
Date

Supervisor:

[REDACTED]

4/19/19
Date

This Report of Investigation is the property of the Office of Investigation, Treasury Office of the Inspector General. It contains sensitive law enforcement information and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission in accordance with 5 U.S.C. § 552. This report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited.

Report of Investigation

Case Name: [REDACTED]

Case # USM-19-0035-I

Page 10 of 10

Exhibits

1. Complaint letter from [REDACTED] Chief USM Police, dated February 22, 2019.
2. Memorandum of Activity, Interview of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] dated February 28, 2019.
3. Memorandum of Activity, Interview of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] dated February 28, 2019.
4. Memorandum of Activity, Interview of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] dated March 7, 2019.
5. Memorandum of Activity, Interview of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] dated March 7, 2019.
6. Memorandum of Activity, Interview of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] dated March 15, 2019.
7. Memorandum of Activity, Interview of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] dated March 7, 2019.
8. Memorandum of Activity, Interview of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] dated March 27, 2019.
9. Memorandum of Activity, Interview of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] dated March 28, 2019.



DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20220

OFFICE OF
INSPECTOR GENERAL

SEP 06 2019

MEMORANDUM FOR [REDACTED], CHIEF
UNITED STATES MINT POLICE

FROM: [REDACTED]
Special Agent in Charge

SUBJECT: [REDACTED] Senior EEO Specialist and Contractor
Philadelphia, PA
United States Mint (USM)

OIG Case Number: USM-19-0035-I

Attached is a revised report of investigation. The original report was sent to the United States Mint (USM) on April 19, 2019, but cited an improper regulation that would not apply to the USM.

An investigation was initiated by the U.S. Department of the Treasury, Office of Inspector General, Office of Investigations (TIG), after receiving information from the USM Police, that [REDACTED] Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Specialist and Contractor, improperly obligated U.S. funds and while improperly acting as a hiring official, sexually harassed two civilian females.

The investigation determined that the allegations of misuse of position and improper obligation of government funds were substantiated. While the subject's actions rose quite close to 'quid pro quo' sexual harassment, conditioning potential employment offers upon his victims' willingness to meet with him and subject themselves to sexual innuendo, TIG did not find that the activity, at the point it was reported, rose to that level. However, TIG found that the individual's actions, particularly as they involved his position within the USM, were prejudicial to the government.

TIG referred generally to the Treasury Employee Rules of Conduct. Recognizing that the subject is a contract employee rather than a civil servant, TIG nevertheless consider these standards to establish behavioral expectations that, if not met, establish serious issues regarding the individual's fitness for further duty in the Treasury environment.

The ROI and attached documentation are provided to assist you in determining whether corrective administrative action may be warranted. Please provide a written response within ninety (90) days of the date on this memorandum advising what administrative actions, if any, you have taken in response to this ROI's finding(s) and/or recommendations, and explaining either why those actions were

taken or why no action was taken. When responding, please identify this matter by its case number, USM-19-0035-I, and transmit your response to the TIG electronic mail intake at OIGINTAKE@oig.treas.gov.

If you have any staff requests, questions concerning this matter, or require any attachments referenced in the ROI exhibits, or if you develop information that may indicate a need for additional or new investigative activity to assist you in resolving this matter, please contact me at ([REDACTED])



DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20220

OFFICE OF
INSPECTOR GENERAL

APR 19 2019

MEMORANDUM FOR [REDACTED], CHIEF
UNITED STATES MINT POLICE

FROM:

[REDACTED]
Special Agent in Charge

SUBJECT:

[REDACTED] EEO (Contractor)
Headquarters
United States Mint (USM)

OIG Case Number: USM-19-0035-I

Attached for your review is our Report of Investigation (ROI) into allegations that [REDACTED] Senior EEO Specialist, misused his position and acted as a hiring manager and obligated US government funds as well as sexually harassed two civilian females. Our investigation substantiated the allegations of misuse of position and obligating government funds as well as making inappropriate comments with one civilian female.

The ROI and attached documentation are provided to assist you in determining whether corrective administrative action may be warranted. Please provide a written response within ninety (90) days of the date on this memorandum advising what administrative actions, if any, you have taken in response to this ROI's finding(s) and/or recommendations, and explaining either why those actions were taken or why no action was taken. When responding, please identify this matter by its case number, USM-19-0035-I, and transmit your response to the TOIG electronic mail intake at OIGINTAKE@oig.treas.gov.

If you have any questions concerning this matter, or require any attachments referenced in the ROI exhibits, or if you develop information that may indicate a need for additional or new investigative activity to assist you in resolving this matter, please contact me at [REDACTED].